



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड : 49	शिमला, शनिवार, 8 दिसम्बर, 2001/17 अग्रहायण, 1923	संख्या : 49
	विषय सूची	
भाग-1	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	1644—1669
भाग-2	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	1669—1670
भाग-3	अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनैशियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि ..	1670—1677
भाग-4	स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग ..	—
भाग-5	व्यक्तिगत अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन ..	1677—1694
भाग-6	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन ..	—
भाग-7	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं ..	—
—	अनुपूरक ..	—

8 दिसम्बर, 2001/17 अग्रहायण, 1923 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'असाधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुई :—

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
No. SEC-13-75/2001, dated 4th December, 2001.	State Election Commission	Notification regarding the delimitation of wards of Municipal Corporation, Shimla.

भाग-1 - वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-1, the 20th November, 2001

No. HHC/GAZ/14-199-90-1-23542.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant one day's earned leave for 26-11-2001 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 25-11-2001 in favour of Shri S.S. Thakur, Registrar (Vigilance) of this Court.

Certified that Shri Thakur is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Thakur would have continued to hold the post of Registrar (Vigilance) of this Court, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 20th November, 2001

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (23)/74-XII-23552.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H.P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare the Senior Sub Judge-cum-Chief Judicial Magistrate, Solan, as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the courts of Sub Judge-cum-JMIC, Kasauli (at Solan) and Sub Judge-cum-JMIC Solan and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T. A. etc. in respect of Class III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid courts under head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the leave period of Sh. Piar Chand Chauhan, Sub Judge-cum-JMIC, Kasauli (at Solan) with effect from 29-10-2001 to 19-11-2001.

Shimla-1, the 21st/22nd November, 2001

No. HHC/GAZ/14-22/74/III-23671.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 4 days earned leave with effect from 26-11-2001 to 29-11-2001 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 25-11-2001 and to suffix gazetted holiday falling on 30-11-2001, in favour of Shri O. P. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Shimla.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge, Shimla, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 21st/22nd November, 2001

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (23)/74-XII-23682.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H.P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare the Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Solan as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Courts of Sub Judge-cum-JMIC, Kasauli (at Solan) and Sub Judge-cum-JMIC Solan and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T. A. etc. in respect of Class-III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid Courts under head "2014 Administration of Justice" with immediate effect till further orders.

Shimla-1, the 21st/22nd November, 2001

No. HHC/GAZ/14-22/74-III-23663.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 2 days commuted leave for 8th and 9th November, 2001 in favour of Shri O. P. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Shimla.

Certified that Shri Sharma has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge, Shimla, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 22nd November, 2001

No. HHC/Admn. 16, 13/74-V-23732.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, u/s 297(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and rule 4 (iv) of the H. P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment and Control) Rules, 1996 is pleased to appoint Shri Hari Chand, Advocate Jubbil as Oath Commissioner at Jubbil for a period of two years with immediate effect for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents, under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

Shimla-1, the 22nd November, 2001

No. HHC/Admn. 16 (7) 74-VI-23741.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 239 (b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, u/s 297 (b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and Rule 4 (iv) of the H. P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment and Control) Rules 1996, is pleased to appoint Shri Subhash Chand Bhattia, Advocate, Dehra as Oath Commissioner at Dehra for a period of two years with effect from 7-12-2001, for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

Shimla-1, the 22nd November, 2001

No. HHC/GAZ Estt. 3 (82)/75-I-23696.—The Hon'ble Chief Justice is pleased to sanction *ex-post-facto* 3 days commuted leave on and *w.e.f.* 7-11-2001 to 9-11-2001 with permission to suffix holidays falling on 10th and 11th November, 2001 in favour of Shri Roshan Lal Mehta, Assistant Registrar of this Court.

Certified that Shri Roshan Lal Mehta has joined the same post and at the same station from where he had proceeded on leave after expiry of the above leave period.

Certified that Shri Roshan Lal Mehta, would have continued to officiate the same post from where he proceeded on leave.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

H.P. STATE CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION, KASUMPTI, SHIMLA-9

OFFICE ORDER

Shimla-9, the 20th November, 2001

No. HP/CPC/1-1/94-2907-08.—Sanction to the grant of 4 days earned leave *w. e. f.* 26-11-2001 to 29-11-2001 alongwith permission to prefix and suffix the holidays falling on 25-11-2001 and 30-11-2001 is hereby accorded in favour of Shri Surinder Kumar, Superintendent, Grade-I, H. P. State Commission.

Certified that he would have continued to hold the post of Superintendent Grade-I, but for his proceeding on earned leave for the abovesaid period.

Sd/-
Registrar.

**GOVERNOR'S SECRETARIAT
HIMACHAL PRADESH
RAJ BHAVAN, SHIMLA-171002**

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 24th November, 2001

No. 3-69/78-GS.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Shri Sumer Chand s/o Late Shri Karta Ram as his Private Secretary against the tenure post, in the pay scale of Rs. 7220—11,660 plus Secretariat Allowance: Rs. 600/- per month from the date he takes over the charge of the post till the date the present Governor remains in office.

Sd/-

Commissioner-cum-Secretary to Governor.

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

**PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT
(A-I)**

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 19th November, 2001

No. Per. (A-I) A (2) 2/90 Vol-II.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Sub Section (1) of Section 20 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Shri Mukesh Sharma, Naib Tehsildar, Chopal to be Executive Magistrate with the powers of Executive Magistrate under the said code to be exercised within the local limits of Tehsil Chopal, District Shimla with immediate effect subject to the conditions as contained in the Home Department's, Himachal Pradesh Government letter No. Home-B(B) 12-5/84 dated 4-12-84 and 28-12-84. He shall cease to function as Executive Magistrate on his transfer out of this jurisdiction.

Shimla-2, the 22nd November, 2001

No. 10-1/72-DP-Apptt-Vol II.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Sub Section (1) of Section 20 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Shri Manoj Kumar Thakur, Naib Tehsildar, Bharmour to be Executive Magistrate with the powers of Executive Magistrate under the said code to be exercised within the local limits of Tehsil Bharmour, District Chamba with immediate effect subject to the conditions as contained in the Home Department's, Himachal Pradesh Government letter No. Home-B (B) 12-5/84 dated 4-12-84 and 28-12-84. He shall cease to function as Executive Magistrate on his transfer out of this jurisdiction.

Shimla-171002 the 22nd November, 2001

No. Per. (A-I) B (2) 6/84.—On the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the promotion of Dr. R. P. Sharma, Additional Director of Horticulture, Himachal Pradesh, Dharamshala as Director of Horticulture, Himachal Pradesh in the pay scale of Rs. 18,600-500-22,100 on regular basis with immediate effect.

Dr. R. P. Sharma shall be on probation period of 2 years in the first instance.

By order,

Sd/-

Chief Secretary.

Shimla-2, the, 23rd November, 2001

No. Per. (A-I) A (2)-290 Vol II.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Sub Section (1) of Section 20 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973,

the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Shri Bhagat Singh Rangta, Naib Tehsildar, Dodra-Kawar to be Executive Magistrate with the powers of Executive Magistrate under the said code to be exercised within the local limits of Tehsil Dodra-Kawar with immediate effect subject to the conditions as contained in the Home Department's, Himachal Pradesh Government letter No. Home-B (B) 12-5/84 dated 4-12-84 and 28-12-84. He shall cease to function as Executive Magistrate on his transfer out of this jurisdiction.

Shimla-2, the 23rd November, 2001

No. 10-2/72-DP-Apptt-Vol-IV.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Sub Section (1) of Section 20 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Shri Ram Chand Kaushal, Naib Tehsildar, Kangra to be Executive Magistrate with the powers of Executive Magistrate under the said code to be exercised within the local limits of Tehsil Kangra with immediate effect subject to the conditions as contained in the Home Department's Himachal Pradesh Government letter No. Home-B (B) 12-5/84 dated 4-12-84 and 28-12-84. He shall cease to function as Executive Magistrate on his transfer out of this jurisdiction.

By order,

Sd/-

F. C.-cum-Secretary.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 3rd August, 2001

No. Agr. B(2)4-95, Vol-II-L.—In partial modification of this Department Notification No. Agri. B(5)-1/2001-L Dated 25-05 2001, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer/adjustment of Smt. Urmil Parmar, DDA at Mandi as Dy. Director of Agriculture against a vacant post caused due to retirement of Shri D. D. Tyagi, DDA on 31-07-2001 with immediate effect in the public interest without TTA.

By order,

S. S. PARMAR,
F.C. cum-Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 4th August, 2001

No. Agr. F(12)-1/99.—With a view to suggest ways and means to develop strategy for the disposal of date expired/banned pesticides in an environmentally safe manner in the State, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute a state level committee of the following officers for evolving a time bound action-plan for identifying land fill sites and for the disposal of date expired/banned pesticides as under:—

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. F.C.-cum-Secretary (Agr.) of the Govt. of Himachal Pradesh. | <i>Chairman</i> |
| 2. F. C.-cum-Secretary (Hort.) to the Govt. of Himachal Pradesh, or his representative. | <i>Member</i> |
| 3. F. C.-cum-Secretary (Fin.) to the Govt. of H.P. or his representative. | <i>Member</i> |
| 4. Secretary (Law) to the Govt. of H. P. or his representative. | <i>Member</i> |
| 5. Secretary, State Pollution Control Board. | <i>Member</i> |
| 6. Head of Deptt. (Agr./Hort.) | <i>Member-Secy.</i> |

The rule/duties of the said committee would be as under:—

FINANCE DEPARTMENT
(Directorate of Small Savings)

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 22nd November, 2001

To monitor/guide the department/agencies in possession of date expired/banned pesticides for identifying land-fill sites and incineration facilities for disposal of banned/date expired pesticides in an environmental manner and also consider evolving a system for sharing the cost of such operation jointly by the State and Pesticide Industry and formulate a system for quarterly monitoring the disposal of date expired/banned pesticides.

By order,

Sd/-
F. C.-cum-Secretary (Agr.).

Shimla-2 the 7th August, 2001

No. Agr. B (5)-2/2000-L.—In partial modification of this Department Notification of even number, dated 23-6-2001, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer/adjustment of Shri D. K. Sharma Subject to matter specialist [U/T from Dev. Block, Bhoranj to Dev. Block, Gopalpur (Sarkaghat)] at Ghumarwin as Sub-Divisional Soil Conservation Officer against vacant post without TTA in the public interest with immediate effect.

Shimla-2, the 7th August, 2001

No. Agr. B (5) 1/2001-L.—In partial modification of this Department Notification of even number, dated 25-05-2001, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to transfer/adjust Shri Surender Singh Thakur, Agriculture Development Officer [U/T from DDA, Bilaspur to Totu Circle (Mashobra Block)] at Ghumarwin in the o/o SDSCO against a vacant post without TTA in the public interest with immediate effect.

By order,

S. S. PARMAR,
F. C.-cum-Secretary (Agr.).

आवकारी एवं कराधान विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला, 23 नवम्बर, 2001

संख्या ई०एस०एन०बी०(३)-११/२०००.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, आवकारी एवं कराधान विभाग के श्री मस्त राम डोगरा, आवकारी एवं कराधान अधिकारी को ३१-३-२००२ अपराहन से उनको अधिवर्षिता आयु पूर्ण करने पर सरकारी सेवा से सेवा निवृत्ति करने के सद्व्यं आदेश देते हैं।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
वित्तायुक्त एवं सचिव।

No. Fin. 2-C (A) SS/77-Vol.-III-1343-1377.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute, with immediate effect, a District Small Savings Advisory Committee in each District of the State. The Committee shall be constituted in the following manner :

1. Deputy Commissioner will be the Chairman of the Committee.
2. Dy. Director, Small Savings/D. S. O./A. D. M./A. C. shall be the Secretary of the Committee.
3. Chairpersons of Zila Parishad, Panchayat Smitis, Nagar Parishad/Nagar Panchayat shall be ex-officio members of the Committee.
4. All District level Officers will be official members of the Committee.
5. Two members from amongst leading agents will be nominated by the Deputy Commissioner (one male and one female).
6. President, District Beopar Mandal.
7. President, District N. G. O's. Federation.
8. President/Presidents, Transport Unions to be nominated by the Deputy Commissioner.
9. One representative of Industries Association.
10. President of the District Bar Association.
11. Such other non-official members as may be nominated by the Government, in each District.

The District Committee will discharge the following functions :—

- (i) To Co-ordinate and guide the Small Savings activities.
- (ii) To assist and advise the Government on measures necessary to spread the National Savings movement in the State.
- (iii) To suggest ways and means of popularising the Small Savings Scheme in the District so as to achieve the target fixed for the District.

The Non-official members of the Committee will be entitled to bus fare for attending the meetings of the Committee, to be paid by the Deputy Commissioner from the Prize Money in the District.

Sd/-
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

FOREST DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 13th July, 2001

No. FFE-A(B)6-3/99-Loose.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer and posting of following IFS HFFS officers in the public interest with immediate effect :—

Sl. No.	Name of the officers	From	To
1	2	3	4

S. Shri :

1. J. S. Walia, IFS

C. F., Bilaspur

Conservator of Forests office of
Chairman, H. P. State Electricity
Board, Shimla.

1	2	3	4
2.	C. S. Singh, IFS	Prof. Dr. Y. S. Parmar University, Nauni.	On repatriation as C. F. (Working Plan), Shimla.
3.	S. S. Saini, IFS	CF (WP), Shimla	C. F., Sanjhi Van Yojna, Shimla.
4.	T. S. Thakur, IFS	C. F., Sanjhi Van Yojna, Shimla	C. F. o/o Engineer-in-Chief H. P. P.W.D., Shimla.
5.	P. L. Chauhan, IFS	DFO, Paonta	DFO, Hamirpur.
6.	Pavnes Kumar, IFS	DFO, Hamirpur	DFO, Dalhousie.
7.	G. R. Sahibi, IFS	DFO (WP), Dehra	DFO, Dehra.
8.	Balbir Singh, IFS	DFO (Hqrs.), Nahan	DFO (Flying Squad), Sundernagar.
9.	S. K. Gupta, IFS	Dy. Director (Enforcement).	DFO (F. T. S.), Sundernagar on the retirement of Shri U. K. Sharma, IFS on 31-7-2001.
10.	Pradeep Kumar, IFS	DFO, Dehra	DFO, Paonta.
11.	D. K. Mehta, HPFS	DFO (WP), Dharamshala.	DFO (Hqr.), Chamba.
12.	J. C. Mandla, HPFS	ACF, Dehra	T. A. to C. F., Dharamshala.
13.	N. S. Thakial, HPFS	T. A. to CF (Chamba).	OSD o/o Director (North) HPSFC, Dharamshala.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order that Shri D. C. Khandoori, IFS, C. F., Mandi will hold the additional charge of C. F., Bilaspur and Shri G. R. Sahibi, IFS will hold the additional charge of DFO (WP), Dehra in addition to their duties, till further orders, for which they will not be entitled for any remuneration.

All the above mentioned officers will relinquish their charge and assume their new assignments immediately under intimation to this Department without awaiting their substitutes and availing the joining time. They will avail their joining time after assuming the new assignments.

By order,

AVAY SHUKLA,
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 16th July, 2001

No. FFE-A(B)1-1/2001.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the retirement of the following IFS Officers of this Department on the dates mentioned against their names :—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer & place of posting	Date of birth	Date of Retirement
S/Shri :			
1.	A. C. Karwasra, CCF (Protection Shimla)	15-07-1942	31-07-2002
2.	A. L. Sharma, CCF (Wild Life), Hamirpur	25-08-1942	31-08-2002
3.	M. P. Singh, C. F., Kullu	07-04-1942	30-04-2002
4.	D. C. Khandoori, C. F., Mandi	18-11-1942	30-11-2002
5.	Balbir Singh, DFO (H. Q.), Nahan	13-04-1942	30-04-2002

Shimla-2, the 13th August, 2001

No. FFE-A(B)18-7/95-ODA-III.—Recognising the need to bring together all forest department stakeholders at local level for ensuring sustainable management of forest resources, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute a multi-stake holder Consultative Forum in each Forest Circle of the H.P. Forest Department with immediate effect.

I. The constitution of the forum will be as under:—

1. Conservator of Forests of the circle	Chairman	7. District Agriculture Officer	Member
---	----------	---------------------------------	--------

2. All DFOs of the Forest Circle (Territorial & Wildlife).	Members
3. Representative of S. E. IPH (XEN level).	Member
4. Representative of CCF (Project)	Member
5. Project Officer DRDA	Member
6. District Panchayati Raj Officer	Member

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 8. District Horticulture Officer | Member |
| 9. District Animal Husbandry Officer | Member |
| 10. Three Presidents of Panchayat Forest Committee falling in the circle. | Members |
| 11. Three Presidents of Village Forest Development Societies in the circle. | Members |
| 12. Two Presidents of Mahila Mandals in the circle. | Members |
| 13. Two NGOs working in natural resource management in the circle. | Members |
| 14. Divisional Forest Officer (Hqr.) of the circle. | Member Secretary-
Convenor. |
- II The forum will have at least one meeting every six months.
- III Members of VFDS, Panchayat Forest Committees and Mahila Mandals will be nominated by the Chairman on rotational basis in a manner to have equal representations from all forest divisions of the circle.
- IV The term of the nominated members will be one year
- V These circles level forum will send its recommendations to the State Level Consultative Forum through CCF (Projects).

ORDER

Shimla-2, the 13th November, 2001

No. FFE-A(B)6-6/96 (Estd.) II Loose.—Whereas on the recommendations of the D. P. C. held on 25-5-2000 in the H. P. Public Service Commission, Shri Kirpal Singh, Forest Ranger was promoted to HPFS in the pay scale of Rs. 7220—11660 on regular basis vide this department's Notification of even number dated 20-10-2001;

Whereas the said Shri Kirpal Singh vide his representation dated nil has intimated that he is nearing superannuation, has put in about thirty five years of service and is having ill health and adverse family circumstances which do not allow him to hold higher responsibility and therefore, he intends to forego his promotion to the HPFS;

Whereas the appointing authority has carefully considered the request of Shri Kirpal Singh, and has decided to accept the same;

Now, therefore, the Governor, H. P. is pleased, to withdraw the promotion granted to Shri Kirpal Singh, Forest Ranger to HPFS vide order dated 20-10-2001 on his own request.

Shimla-2, the 17th November, 2001

No. FFE-A(B)1-2-2001. The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to create one ex-cadre post of Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) in the pay scale of Rs. 24050—650—26000 in the State cadre of IFS with immediate effect for a period of 2 years under the provisions of Rule 4(2) of the IFS (Cadre Rules), 1966 in the public interest.

Notification regarding duties, functions and jurisdiction of Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) H. P. shall be issued separately.

By order,

Sd/-
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 4th April, 2001

No. Udyog-II(Chh)22-8 88-II.—In supersession of all the previous notifications issued by this department regarding constitution of Board of Directors of H. P. General Industries Corporation Ltd. and in exercise of the powers conferred vide section 123 and 155 of Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Himachal Pradesh General Industries Corporation, the Governor, H. P. is pleased to nominate the Board of Directors of Himachal Pradesh General Industries Corporation Ltd. with immediate effect as under :—

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Sh. Kishori Lal Vaidya,
Industries Minister | .. Chairman |
| 2. Sh. Vijay Kumar Joshi,
Vice-Chairman. HP GIC | .. Director |
| 3. Sh. Arvind Kaul,
F. C.-cum-Secretary (Inds.) | .. Director |
| 4. Sh. P. C. Dhiman,
Director of Industries | .. Director |
| 5. Sh. B. S Chauhan,
MD, HPSIDC | .. Director |
| 6. Sh. V. P. Gupta,
MD, HPGIC | .. Director |
| 7. Smt. Upma Chaudhary,
MD, HPFC | .. Director |
| 8. Sh. Abhay Pant,
Addl. Secretary (Finance) | .. Director |

NON OFFICIAL :

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 9. Sh. Ramesh Sharma,
V&PO Nalti. Teh. & Distt. Hamirpur | .. Director |
| 10. Dr. Shrikant,
V&PO Baddi, Teh. Nalagarh, Distt. Solan | .. Director |
| 11. Sh. Narinder Singh,
Vill. Daulatpur Chowk, Teh. Amb, Distt. Una | .. Director |
| 12. Sh. H. D. Gajwani,
Circular Road, Solan | .. Director |

By order,

ARVIND KAUL,
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 26th May, 2001

No. Ind. A(A)-1-1/2001.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to promote Shri Amar Chand Chauhan, Personal Assistant to the newly created post of Private Secretary Class-II Gazetted in the pay scale of Rs. 7220—11660 in the Department of Industries purely on *ad hoc* basis for a period of six months or till the post is filled up on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the public interest with immediate effect.

The above officer will have no right to claim regular promotion or seniority or continuance on the above post on account of his above mentioned *ad hoc* promotion.

By order,

Sd/-
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 20th June, 2001

No Ind A(F)20-11/2000.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute a Screening Committee in order to short list the Company for setting up of a large cement plant based on Bhaga-Bhalag limestone deposits in District Solan, H. P., on the basis of their capability and preparedness to set up cement plant in a reasonable timeframe, as under :—

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Chief Secretary | .. Chairman |
| 2. F. C.-cum-Secretary (Inds.) | .. Member |
| 3. F. C.-cum-Secretary (Fin.) | .. Member |
| 4. Director (Inds.) | .. Member-Secy. |
| 5. State Geologist
(Directorate of Industries) | .. Member |

Shimla-2, the 20th June, 2001

No. Ind. A (F) 7-1/2000.—The Governor has been receiving representations from various industrial units whose profitability has been affected as a result of changes in the Governments industrial policy, as well as policies/schemes of other departments, particularly the Excise and Taxation Department, in order to expedite decisions on these representations the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute an Empowered Committee which would examine the various representations of the Industrial Units and also be empowered to take final decision keeping in view the genuine problems of the Industries. The constitution of the committee will be as under:-

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Industries Minister | Chairman |
| 2. Secretary (Industries) | .. Member |
| 3. Secretary (Excise & Taxation) | .. Member |
| 4. Secretary of any other deptt.
concerned with specific issue | .. Member |
| 5. Director of Industries | .. Member-Secretary |

By order,

ARVIND KAUL,
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 12th November, 2001

No. Udyog-II (Chh) 11-4/80/III.—In supersession of this department notification of even number dated 9-12-1999 regarding constitution of Board of Director of H. P. State Handicrafts and Handloom Corporation Ltd. and in exercise of powers conferred vide section-67 of Memorandum and Articles of Association of Himachal Pradesh State Handicrafts and Handloom Corpn. Ltd., the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to nominate Shri R. K. Sood, I. P. S. Managing Director, H. P. State Handicrafts and Handloom Corpn. Ltd. as Director in the Board of Directors of H. P. State Handicrafts and Handloom Corpn. Ltd., in place of Shri Deepak Bagai, IPS the then Managing Director of H. P. State Handicraft and Handloom Corpn. Ltd. from the date of assuming his new assignment.

By order,

Sd/-
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

सिचाई एवं जन स्वास्थ्य विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 12 नवम्बर, 2001

संख्या सिचाई 11-82/2000-सोलन.—यस: हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन के लिए नामतः गांव बाहवां, तहसील अर्की, जिला सोलन में पम्प हाऊस के निर्माण के लिए भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्द्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता

है कि निम्नलिखित विस्तृत विवरणों में दर्शित भूमि उपर्युक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन सभी सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों की सूचना के लिए घोषणा की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन समाहर्ता भू-अर्जन, हिमाचल प्रदेश, लोक निर्माण विभाग सोलन को उक्त भूमि के अर्जन के लिए आदेश देने का एतद्द्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक समाहर्ता भू-अर्जन, लोक निर्माण विभाग सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है :

विस्तृत विवरणों

जिला : सोलन

तहसील : अर्की

गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र बीघा विस्त्रा
बाहवां	185/1	0 16
आदेश द्वारा, हस्ताक्षरित/- सचिव।		

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 29th September, 2001

No. 19-8/97-Shram-II.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 17(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of the awards in the Rajpatra announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court of the following cases:—

Sl. No.	Particulars	Section	Remarks
1	2	3	4
1.	Ref. No. 100/96-Sh. Inder Singh Vs. C. F. J. V.	-10--	Publication
2.	Ref. No. 68/96-Sh. Padam Singh Vs. C. F. J. V.	-10-	-do-
3.	Ref. No. 72/96. C. F. J. V. Workers Ekta Union (CITU) Vs. C. F. J. V.	-10-	-do-
4.	Ref. No. 189/98 Khayalli Ram Vs. H. P. State, Elect. Board, Division, Rajgarh.	-10-	-do-
5.	Ref. No. 84/96- Sh. Amin Chand & others Vs. C. F. J. V.	-10-	-do-
6.	Ref. No. 57/97- Sh. Prem Chand & others Vs. M/O Tissue and Fibers Ltd., Gollamala.	-10-	-do-
7.	Ref. No. 66/99- Sh. Sant Ram Vs. State of H. P. (Forest) & D. F. O. Renuka & others.	-10-	-do-
8.	Ref. No. 51/97- Sh. Sunil Datt & others Vs. I. & P. H., Nahan.	-10-	-do-
9.	Ref. No. 16/57- Sh. Roshan Lal & others Vs. HPPWD Div., Nahan.	-10-	-do-
10.	Ref. No. 83/97- Baryam Singh & others Vs. R. E. Giri Power House, P/Sahib.	-10-	-do-
11.	Ref. No. 257/98- Prakash Chand Vs. M/s Hotel Chanden, The Mall, Shimla.	-10-	-do-
12.	Ref. No. 17/98- Sh. Gurdev Singh Vs. Asstt. Executive Engg. Electrical Sub-Division, Ganguwal.	-10-	-do-

By order,
Sd/-

ACS-cum-Secretary (Lab. & Emp).

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 100/96.

Instituted on 9-9-1996.

Decided on 7-7-2001.

Shri Inder Singh son of Shri Hari Ram, Village Gaohu
Dhar, P.O. Khakrana, Teh. & Distt. Mandi, (H. P.)
Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Continental Foundation Joint Venture V. P. C.
Sholding, District Kinnaur, H. P. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Dispute
Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri Hem Raj, AR.

For respondent : Shri Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate.

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government regarding the legality of the termination of service of Shri Inder Singh by the Continental Foundation Joint Venture (CFJV) in terms of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the claim petition filed by the petitioner, he has submitted that he was appointed as Driver by the CFJV on 24-7-1995 and he worked as such till 7-3-1996 as his services were terminated illegally on 8-3-1996. It is submitted that neither he was given any notice nor he was paid any retrenchment compensation. Therefore, his termination from service is illegal and he is entitled to be re-instated with retrospective effect with consequential reliefs like back wages etc.

2. In the reply filed by the CFJV, preliminary objection has been taken that the pleadings which are beyond the perview of the reference cannot be raised before this Tribunal.

3. On merits, it is contended that the petitioner was required to be employed for at least a period of one year in order to invoke the provisions of section 25-F of the act. It is submitted that petitioner did not complete 240 days in one year and therefore, he was not entitled to the benefits of section 25-F of the Act.

4. It is further submitted that petitioner was on probation initially for six months which could be extended at the discretion of the management and petitioner was on the deemed extended probation when his services were dispensed with. It is further contended that petitioner was a driver had hit a jeep while driving the ALRD Dumper on 6-10-1995 and caused damage for which a warning was issued to him. Then again on 1-3-1996, he hit a vehicle causing loss to the respondent company. Therefore, services of the petitioner was terminated during the probation period as his work was not found satisfactory.

5. It is also submitted that petitioner had been taking leave repeatedly during the period of employment and was overstaying after his sanctioned leave and there by he availed the leave which was more than permissible under the certified standing orders. Lastly, it is submitted that as an employer, respondent was within its right to terminate the services of the petitioner if his work was not found satisfactory during the probation period. Hence, petitioner is not entitled to the relief claimed by him.

6. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 1-9-1997:—

1. Whether the termination from service of the petitioner by the respondent management is violative of section 25-F of the act on the grounds as alleged ?
OPP.

2. Whether the reference is not maintainable in view of the objections taken up in the preliminary grounds. OPR,

3. Relief.

Findings :

7. Issue No. 1.—It is not disputed by the petitioner that he had not completed 240 days and so is not covered under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. However, the contention of the petitioner is that since his termination is stigmatic and had been caused due to his alleged absence from duty by availing of more leave than permissible, and on account of his allegedly causing two accidents of the motor vehicles belonging to CFJV, hence, in the garb of terminating his services for having not completed the probation period satisfactorily he has in fact been punished for the alleged accidents without giving him any opportunity of being heard. So, the termination is bad in law.

8. Petitioner has come in the witness box and Shri Vijay Singh Fojdar has been examined on behalf of the respondent. Petitioner in his evidence has admitted that he was appointed as per the letter Ex. R-1. He has admitted that he availed of the leave as per documents Ex. R-2 to Ex. R-8. He also admitted that he was on probation as per Ex. R-1 and there was an accident involving the vehicle driven by him and he was served with a warning for this accident. However, he denied that he committed another accident on 1-3-1996 and he was transferred from slide area to the Administrative area.

9. Shri Vijay Singh Fojdar has exhibited all the documents and has mentioned that petitioner was habitual in extending his leave unauthorisedly and he was also responsible for causing damage due to the accidents caused by him. He however, admits that reasons for his unauthorised absence were found justified and so no show cause notice was served on the petitioner for his unauthorised absence. He has also admitted that no enquiry was conducted into the cases of the accident and the warning was issued on the report of the Site Incharge.

10. The appointment letter Ex. PA mentions that petitioner will be on probation for a period of six months which can be extended at the discretion of the management and unless until specific letter confirming his service is issued, he will be deemed to be on extended period of probation. Besides the leave applications, the joining reports are on record. There is a letter of warning Ex. R-9 which was issued on 6-10-1995 and a transfer order for transferring the services of the petitioner to Administrative area from the Slide area. Lastly the termination order Ex. R-10 mentions that since the services of the petitioner has not been found satisfactory, so his services are being terminated in term of the Clause 2 of the Appointment letter.

11. On the basis of this documentary and oral evidence, it is clear that the petitioner was still on probation as there was no letter of confirmation issued in his favour. It is also established on record that the petitioner had not completed 240 days of service in one calendar year. Further it is also established from record that petitioner had availed of leave which was more than that was due to him and had remained unauthorisedly absent for few days in between though such unauthorised leave and other leave seems to have been allowed to the petitioner subsequently. The letter of warning also shows that management held him responsible for the accident for the ALDR being driven by him and also he was transferred for causing another accident subsequently. The question which arises is whether in this background of the matter, the employer has a right to discharge an employee for non completion of his probation period satisfactory or whether he is to be charge-sheeted before his services were terminated. In 1996 1 SCC-360 Hon'ble the Supreme Court has held :—

“The Hon ble Court was justified in discharging the petitioner from service during the period of his

probation. It is not necessary that there should be a charge and enquiry of his conduct. Since the petitioner is only on probation and during the period of probation, it would be open to the Hon'ble Court to consider whether he is suitable for confirmation or should he be discharged from service."

12. The facts of the present case are somewhat similar. The employer has to watch the overall conduct of the employee during the probation period and his services can be discharged if his work is not found satisfactory. This important right of the employer in case of his probationary employment is wider than the right of the employer with regard to regular employees, as a regular employee has a right to the post until he is terminated or dismissed for misconduct etc., and, in that event opportunity is required to be given to the employee to plead his defence. Therefore, during the probation period, employer has a right to discharge the employee if his work is not found satisfactory. Similar view has been taken in 1997-8-SCC-461. It is held :

"The period of probation is a period of test during which the work and conduct of an employee is under scrutiny. If on an assessment of his work and conduct during this period it is found that he was not suitable for the post. It would be open to the employer to terminate his services."

13. The argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the order of termination is stigmatic in nature does not appear to be correct. Even by looking behind the order of termination, which is apparently a letter of termination simpliciter, the action of the employer is not established to be punitive. No doubt he was accused of causing accidents, but he was let off with a warning. Secondly, though he overstayed his leave unauthorisedly, his authorised absence was condoned retrospectively. It shows that employer was rather generous in his dealings with the employee and retained him even after these lapses. However, overall his work and conduct was not found up to the mark during probation period which lead to his discharge. The letter of termination does not speak of any misconduct etc. of the petitioner, I, therefore hold that the services of the petitioner has rightly been discharged/terminated due to the non completion of the probation period satisfactorily and he was not entitled to any notice or retrenchment compensation as he had not completed 240 days of service during the calendar year. Hence, the issue is decided accordingly against the petitioner.

14. *Issue No. 2.*—This issue has not been pressed at the stage of arguments. Moreover, the specific reference is regarding the legality of the retrenchment in terms of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act and claim petition is only with regard to the dispute referred to this forum. Hence, this objection has no merit and is decided against the respondent.

RELIEF

15. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, the reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for its publication in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 7th Day of July, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla.

Ref. No. 68 of 1996.
Instituted on : 27-5-1996.
Decided on : 7-7-2001.

Shri Padam Singh son of Shri Chain Singh c/o
General Secretary, CFJV Workers Union, Sholding,
Bhawa Nagar, (H. P.) .. Petitioner.

Versus.

M/s Continental Foundation Joint Venture Bhawa
Nagar, Distt. Kinnaur, through its Project Manager
.. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial
Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri Hem Raj AR.

For respondent : Shri Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the
appropriate government :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Padam Singh by the Management of M/s Continental Foundation Joint Venture, Bhawanagar, Distt. Kinnaur (H. P.) without notices, charge-sheet, enquiry and compliance of Section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified, if not, to what relief of past service, back wages and amount of compensation, Shri Padam Singh is entitled to ?"

2. In the claim petition, which has been filed by the petitioner, it is contended that he was appointed as unskilled worker on 16-7-1994 vide a written appointment letter and his services were terminated on 30-1-1996 alleging there in that petitioner has remained absent from service without any leave. It is submitted that termination of his service amounts to dismissal, which has been done without serving any charge-sheet and without holding any domestic enquiry. Therefore, his termination is bad in law and he is entitled to re-instatement in service with all consequential benefits.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, it is submitted that petitioner was appointed as unskilled worker for a specific period of 18 months. He was on probation which could be extended by the management and further the services of the petitioner were terminated on account of his continuous absence from his duty and it is also contended that initially also, petitioner was found guilty of inciting the workers to stop the work and a proper enquiry was held into the allegations. However, the management took a lenient view and only issued a warning to the petitioner not to repeat such type of action in future. It is also submitted that petitioner absented from duty from 4-9-1995 to 18-9-1995. Again he was served a show cause notice and his explanation was called and though his explanation was not found satisfactory, but again taking a lenient view he was only warned to be careful in future.

4. Again petitioner absented himself from duty from 1-1-1996. He was sent a letter through registered post to join duties latest by 20-1-1996, but he did not report for duty. Again another letter was sent to him on 22-1-1996 asking him to join the duty before 29-1-1996, failing which it will be assumed that he was not interested to continue in the job. It is contended that though this letter was sent through registered post but the petitioner did not join duty and therefore, in view of the Certified Standing Orders, (which provides that a workman who absents himself for 10 consecutive days, will be deemed to have left the service of the joint venture without notice) the services of the petitioner was terminated by a written order. Hence, petitioner is not entitled to any relief claimed by him. Moreover, since the petitioner was appointed only for a period of 18 months, therefore, he is not entitled to any continuity of service after this period.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 3-3-1997 :—

1. Whether the dismissal of the petitioner from the employment is without appropriate enquiry and charge-sheet as alleged ?"

.. OPP.

2. Relief.

FINDINGS

6. *Issue No. 1.*—The main contention of the learned counsel of the petitioner is that since petitioner had completed more than 240 days of service, so irrespective of his being on probation, he was entitled to all the benefits under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and his termination amounts to retrenchment which has not been done in accordance with law. It is also contended that petitioner was not given any opportunity to explain his absence from duty and so the principles of natural justice have been flouted. Lastly, that the employment of the petitioner specifically for 18 months is illegal and matter is under challenge in a separate reference. Therefore, petitioner is entitled to reinstatement with all consequential benefits.

7. The argument of the learned counsel for the respondent on the other hand is that as per the Certified Standing Orders, petitioner lost his lien on the job due to his absence from duty for a period of more than 10 days. It is also contended that registered letters were sent to the petitioner to join duties on the address which he had given and so there was sufficient notice to the petitioner, but despite these notices, he failed to report for duty. Hence, in view of the Certified Standing Orders, he is presumed to have abandoned the job himself and his termination is legal and justified.

8. There is no dispute that petitioner has completed more than 240 days of service, though it is admitted further that there is no letter of confirmation on record, which means that he was still on extended period of probation. The petitioner has relied upon 1998 I LLJ 523, which is a judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan. In this authority it has been held that it is mandatory for management to comply with the section in case of probationer whose services are required to be terminated and who had worked for more than 240 days. It is further held that employer has to give opportunity to workman if termination is to be sought before expiry of probation period. Relying on this authority, petitioner has contended that petitioner was entitled to a notice and retrenchment compensation or he was entitled to an opportunity before an enquiry officer if he was found to be guilty of misconduct for remaining absent unauthorisedly.

Petitioner has stepped into the witness box and has also examined Shri Arvind Kumar the General Secretary of the workers union. On behalf of the respondent, Shri Vijay Singh Fojdar has stepped into the witness box. Petitioner has mentioned that he was the Incharge of the Mess till 1-1-1996 and he had remained absent as he was collecting the unpaid dues from the workers who were taking food in the mess. He has been questioned about the earlier enquiry and he has been put documents in connection with that enquiry which he has admitted. He has mentioned in the cross-examination that in the capacity of a mess incharge, he could have gone anywhere without seeking the permission of the management he however, admits that the address given on the letters sent to him are correct, but he denied having received any of the letters.

9. Shri Arvind Kumar PW-2 has mentioned that there was an agreement between the management and the union that the Incharge of the Mess will only give the duty in the mess, which included the collection of money from the workers and making purchases of the articles for the mess etc. He, however, in the cross-examination though has stated that agreement is in unity but the alleged agreement has not been brought by him in the court.

10. Shri Vijay Singh Fojdar has exhibited the appointment letter and also the record of the enquiry which was held earlier by the CFJV. He has also produced the record of his absence and the two letters which were written to him for joining the duty, latest by 20-11-1996 and then by 29-1-1996. He has exhibited the postal receipts and also the report of the time keeper that petitioner has not joined the duty. He has also mentioned

that as per clause 16 of the Certified Standing Orders, action could be taken against the petitioner for remaining absent from duty. He has denied that person who is elected as Mess Manager is only to look after the mess.

11. The documents which have been brought on record have already been discussed by me above. Suffice to say that they are letters of appointment termination and letters written to the petitioner to join duties, besides the record of the earlier enquiry etc. Copy of the Certified Standing Orders has also been placed on file.

12. Undisputedly petitioner had completed more than 240 days even while on probation and as per the authority cited above of Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan petitioner was entitled to the safe-guards given under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. No doubt as per clause 16 of the certified standing orders, continuous unauthorised absence of more than 10 days amounts to giving up the lien on the post, but the principle of natural justice require that the explanation of the employee should be sought before his services are dispensed with under this clause. Though the petitioner has taken the plea that he was absent from duty on account of collecting the mess dues, which was part of his duty, however, this appears to be just an after thought. He has not made mention of this fact in his claim petition. Moreover, he has contended that he was mess Incharge till 1-1-1996, whereas his absence from duty is from 1-1-1996 to 29-1-1996, when admittedly, he was not the mess Incharge. It has also come on record that two letters were sent to him through registered post on the permanent address given by the petitioner asking him to join duty, failing which, he will be deemed to have left the job on his own. Though no acknowledgement of these letters are on record, but it can be presumed in view of the postal receipt that the letters were sent on the address given by the employee himself and must have been received by him. The fact remains that despite such communication, petitioner did not join duty. However, whether such an act of the petitioner amount to misconduct is a fact with requires consideration. Since petitioner had completed 240 days of work, a notice of 30 days was required to be served on the petitioner assigning the reason of his remaining absent from duty for retrenching his service and he could have been offered compensation, which was due to him. No such compliance has been made. This shows that though the termination order has been issued but the compliance of the conditions precedent of such retrenchment under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, have not been followed, which makes this order bad in law. This reference has been received in the Court on 27-5-1996. The service of the petitioner has been dispensed with on 30-1-1996. Meaning thereby that the petitioner raised the dispute immediately and he had no intentions of abandoning the job at all. Therefore, the termination of the petitioner cannot be held justified in the present circumstances. It has been held by Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta in 2000-1-LLJ-686 that where the standing orders provide that absence for more than 8 days is to be deemed to be voluntary abandonment of service by workman, the workman has to be given opportunity to explain reasons for his absence and the management having taken absence of workmen as ground for termination cannot resile therefrom and the workman was guilty of misconduct. Again in 1995 Lab. I. C. 2446, Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has held that termination on the ground of absence from duty amounts to retrenchment and procedure prescribed under Section 25-F of the act is required to be followed. Further that the absence cannot be equated with abandonment from service. So, the petitioner who had completed more than 240 days of service was entitled to all the safe-guards provided under section 25-F of the Act. In this case, except that he was required to join by a particular date, no notice was given to him terminating his services. No retrenchment compensation was offered to him. Therefore, the termination of service of the petitioner is violative of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act.

13. Though no arguments have been addressed that the appointment was for a specified period of 18 months.

net the services of the petitioner has been disengaged. So he was entitled to all the benefits available under section 25-F of the Act. Hence, the issue is decided accordingly in favour of the petitioner.

RELIEF

14. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the retrenchment of the petitioner is illegal. He is entitled to re-instatement in service with seniority and full back wages as the matter has been raised by him without any unnecessary delay. There is also no evidence on record that the petitioner is gainfully employed during this period. Therefore the reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the H. P. Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today this 7th day of July, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

In re :

Ref. : 72/96

Instituted on : 6-1-96

Decided on : 10-7-2001

C. F. J. V. Workers Ekta Union (CITU) Bhawa
Nagar, District Kinnaur (H. P.) .. Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Continental Foundation Joint Venture, Bhawa
Nagar, District Kinnaur, H. P. through its Priject
Manager. .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947.

For Petitioner : Shri Hem Raj, AR.

For Rsepondent : Shri Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate

AWARD

This reference has been received from appropriate
Government which reads as under:—

1. "Whether the termination of workmen by the management of Continental Foundation Joint Venture, Nathpa, District Kinnaur, H. P. on contract basis for specific period is justified and legal? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"
2. Whether the action of the workmen going on strike w. e. f. 21-6-95 is legal and justified? If yes, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"
3. Whether the termination of Sh. Jagat Ram, Ex-President, C. F. J. V. Workers Ekta Union (CITU) Bhawa Nagar, District Kinanur, H.P. on the basis of contract of 18 months service as stipulated in the appointment letter is legal and justified. If not to what relief he is entitled?"

2. The petitioner has alleged that he alongwith other workers was employed for a specific period of 18 months as per the appointment letter. However, this stipulation in the appointment letter is unconscionable and is un-lawful as the work of the project which was to be completed in 56 months is still continuing.

3. It is submitted that the respondent started terminating the services of workers on the basis of stipulation given in the appointment letter and the request of the union for ignoring this illegal condition was not considered by the management. So the union decided to proceed in strike which started from 21-6-1995 and continued till 5-7-1995. It is submitted that the service of the petitioner was terminated mala fide as he was Ex-Vice-President of the union and so his termination from service is illegal and punitive. It is contended that the appointment letter issued to the petitioner for offering employment for a specific period is illegal, so he should be reinstated with consequential benefits and that he should be paid wages for the strike period i. e. from 21-6-1995 to 5-7-1995

4. In the detailed reply filed by the respondent, it is submitted that the project which is being undertaken by the respondent was time bound and had to be completed in 56 months. It is further stated that appointment of the workers was being made in accordance with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and there is no illegality in the same. It is further submitted that the Law provides for the termination of the service on completion of contractual period of employment. Therefore, the service of the petitioner could be terminated as per the conditions of the employment. It is emphasized that under the contract of service the employment of the petitioner automatically came to an end on the expiry of the term of contract. It is also submitted that no notice of the strike was served on the management as per the Certified Standing Orders and therefore, the strike was illegal. Further that the strike was declared illegal by the Financial Commissioner on 29-6-1995. Therefore, the strike being illegal, petitioner is not entitled to the wages for this period. Hence, the claim of the petitioner is bad and is not justified.

5. On the pleadings of the parties my Ltd. predecessor framed the following issues on 1-9-1997 :—

1. Whether the engagement of the petitioner workmen by the respondent company on contract basis for a specific period is justified and legal as alleged? OPR.
2. Whether the strike resorted to by the petitioner workmen w.e.f. 21-6-1995 is legal and justified as alleged? OPP.
3. Whether the termination of Jagat Ram one of the petitioner on the basis of contract of 18 month is illegal and unwarranted on the grounds as alleged? OPP.
4. Relief.

FINDINGS

6. Issues 1 & 3.—Both these issues relates to common questions of facts and law hence, will be dealt with jointly. Petitioner Jagat Ram has stepped in to witness box and on behalf of the respondent Sh. Vijay Singh Faujdar has appeared in the Court. The main thrust of the statement of the petitioner is that he alongwith other employees numbering about 1200 were given appointment letters mentioning that they will be employed for 18 months. However, as the project was to be completed in 56 months, therefore, the employees, under the CITU union protested against the fixed tenure of 18 months. He has further mentioned that he was the Vice-President of the union and when the management did not accede to their demands, the employees resorted to strike which continued for 15 days i.e. 21-6-1995 to 5-7-1995. He has also mentioned that his services were terminated in June, 1995, whereas other workers are still continuing to work. He has been cross-examined on the line that as per his letter of appointment, his services were terminated on 3-6-1996 on completion of 18 months which he admitted. He has also mentioned that a notice was given before resorting to strike but he has not been able to place the copy of the said notice on record.

7. Sh. Vijay Singh Faujdar has also emphasized on terms of employment as provided in the appointment letter issued to the petitioner and has mentioned that the services of the petitioner came to an automatic end after 18 months of the employment. He has also mentioned that no notice was given before the strike. The matter was referred to the Labour Department and the strike was prohibited and thereafter, the matter was referred to the Labour Court. In the cross-examination he has admitted that the work of the project is still going on though it had started in 1993. He has also mentioned the work which was being done by Sh. Jagat Ram is still available. Further that almost all the workers had been given similar appointment letters i.e. giving them employment for a specific period but 90 % of the workers are still being retained. He has also mentioned that during the conciliation proceedings appointment letter was one of the issue which was discussed and the matter was referred to this Court.

8. The statements of the witnesses reveal that the appointment letter was issued to the petitioners in which he was offered employment for a specific period of 18 months which expired on 3-7-1995. It is also evident from their statements that the project work which was to be completed within 56 months is still incomplete. Further the statement of RW Shri Vijay Singh Faujdar reveals that the work which was being done by the petitioner is still available. Another significant aspect of his statement is that 90% of the employees who had been given similar appointment letters for a fixed tenure are still continuing to work though Shri Vijay Singh Faujdar stated that they had been retained under the pressure from the union. There is also no rebuttal to the assertion of the petitioner that he was the Vice President of the workers Union and had participated in the conciliation proceedings regarding the demand of waiving this condition of appointment letter. In this background of the matter, the legal position has to be analysed. Section 2 (00) of the Industrial Disputes Act defines the word 'Retrenchment' and Clause (bb) of section 2 (00) excludes 'the termination of the service of the workman as a result of the non renewal of the contract of the employee between the employer and workman concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein' from this definition of retrenchment. On the strength of this definition, the respondent has vehemently argued that management is within its right to terminate the service of an employee on the completion of fixed tenure of employment. Therefore, it does not amount to retrenchment and the claim of the petitioner therefore, cannot be entertained. The respondent has also relied upon 1994-2-SCC-323, 1994-2-ILJ-488 and 1994 (supplement) 2-SCC-745 to support his argument. His contention is that there is automatic termination of the service by efflux of time and it does not amount to retrenchment. Further that this condition given in the appointment letter is in consonance with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore, the termination of Shri Jagat Ram is not illegal and this condition is also not contrary to law.

9. Argument of the petitioner on the other hand is that irrespective of Clause (bb) of section 2 (00) of the Act, the action of the management is mala fide and is in fact colourable exercise of its powers. Firstly there is no reason or justification for giving appointment for 18 months when the work was to continue for 56 months and is in fact continuing till date, secondly that the work which was being done by the petitioner is admittedly still available with the management and lastly that he being the Vice-President of the workers union has been punished under the garb of this colourable exercise of powers.

10. I have considered the arguments of the parties and have also gone through the written arguments submitted by them. Though sub-clause (bb) of section 2 (00) is purported to exclude the termination of service of a workman as a result of the non renewal of the employment between the employer and employee concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein from the general definition of the 'retrenchment', but

it has to be seen whether such condition in the appointment letter is reasonable and bona fide or whether it has been added to get away from the rigours of the provisions of I.D. Act. Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh has laid down the following principle for interpretation and application of the provisions of this clause in 1996 -Lab. I. C. -1161;

- "(i) that the provisions of section 2 (00) (bb) are to be construed benevolently in favour of the workman;
- (ii) that if the workman is allowed to continue in service by making periodic appointments from time to time, then it can be said that the case would not fall under section 2 (00) (bb);
- (iii) that the provisions of S. 2 (00) (bb) are not to be interpreted in the manner which may stifle the main provision;
- (iv) that if the workman continues in service, the non-renewal of the contract can be deemed as mala fide and it may amount to be fraud on statute;
- (v) that there would be wrong presumption of non applicability of section 2 (00) (bb) where the work is of continuous nature and there is nothing on record that the work for which a workman has been appointed had come to an end."

11. Since work is available and project is still incomplete so non renewal of the contract in this case can be construed to be mala fide. It has also been held that there would be wrong preception of non applicability of Section 2 (00) (bb) where work is of continuous nature and there is nothing on record that the work for which workman had been appointed had come to an end. In 1990 Lab., I. C. 100 Hon'ble Bombay High Court has held:

"that the mere fact that the contract of employment provided termination of by efflux of time, would not be itself be sufficient to take such termination out of the scope of the definition of 'retrenchment'. The adjudicator has to address himself to the question as to whether the period of employment was stipulated in the contract of employment as a device to escape the applicability of the definition of 'retrenchment'."

12. Again hon'ble single Judge of the Punjab & Haryana High Court has held in BALBIR SINGH v. KURUKSHETRA CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. reported in 1990-1-LLJ-443 that:

"that this clause being in the nature of an exception cannot be given meaning which will nullify or curtail the ambit of the principle clause, because it is not intended to be an outlet to unscrupulous employers to shunt out workmen in the garb of non renewal of the contract even if the work subsists. The clause, therefore, has to be construed strictly in favour of the workman as far as possible. This provision cannot be resorted to, to frustrate the claim of the employee against uncalled for retrenchment or for denying other benefits. In other words, it is not to be so interpreted as to enable an employer to resort to the policy of 'hire and fire' and give unguided power to him to renew or not renew the contract, irrespective of the circumstances in which it was entered into or the nature and extent of work for which he was employed. It has to be interpreted to limit it to the case where the work itself has been accomplished and the agreement of hiring for a specific period was genuine. If the work continues, the non-renewal of the contract has to be dubbed as mala fide."

13. So in view of these catina of authorities, it can be held that the stipulation given in the appointment letter was not reasonable and bona fide. The

appointment letter does not speak of any reason as to why the appointment was only for 18 months when the work was available for 56 months and is infact still continuing. Therefore, I hold and decide issue No. 1 & 3 in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

14. **ISSUE NO. 2.**—The petitioner has admitted that the employees proceeded on strike when their demands were not accepted. It is not proved by him that any notice was given as per the certified Standing orders before proceeding on strike. Moreover it has come on record that despite the strike having been declared illegal, it continued till 5-7-1995. Therefore, it appears that the strike was resorted to without exhausting other remedial measures and was continued despite it having been declared illegal. Admittedly, the petitioner did not work during this period of strike, so they cannot be held to be entitled to the pay for this period. Even the petitioner has not stated anything while appearing in the witness box as to how and why they are entitled to the wages for this period. I, therefore, decide this issue against the petitioner.

RELIEF

15. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, the retrenchment of the petitioner is illegal Points No. 1 & 3 of the reference are decided in favour of the petitioner. He is entitled to re-instatement in service with seniority and full back wages. There is no evidence on record that the petitioner was gainfully employed during this period. Hence, the reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today this 10th day of July, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR
Presiding Judge,
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No : 189/98 .

Instituted on : 11-9-1998

Decided on : 21-7-2001

Khayalli Ram son of Shri Dalia Ram, r/o Piran (Nalta),
P. O. Piran, Tehsil Junga, District Shimla, Himachal
Pradesh *Petitioner.*

Versus

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Division
Rajgarh, District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh, through
its Executive Engineer *Respondent.*

*Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Dispute
Act, 1947.*

For petitioner: Shri S. S. Desta, Advocate.

For respondent: Shri S. P. Sharma, AR.

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government : —

“कि क्या श्री ख्याली राम को नियोजक हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद मण्डल नाहन द्वारा बिना नोटिस जांच कार्यवाही व छंटनी मुआवजा दिए वगैर नौकरी से निकालना उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है, यदि नहीं तो कामगार किस क्षतिपूर्ति एवं सेवालाभों का हकदार है ?”

2. Petitioner has alleged in the claim petition that he was working as daily wage with the respondent from May, 1980 to June, 1983 continuously and without interruption. However, his services were terminated

in June, 1984. He approached various functionaries of that State Electricity Board, but to no effect and so he raised the Industrial Dispute and the matter was referred to this Court as no conciliation could take place before the Conciliation officer. He has prayed that he may be reinstated with seniority and full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, it is contended that the claim is ancient and has been raised after a decade. It is also submitted that no vested right of the petitioner has been infringed.

4. On merits, it is contended that the petitioner only worked from 21-7-1981 to 29-12-1981 and did not complete more than 135 days of work. Further that he left the job on his own and was never terminated. It is also submitted that there is no violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as he has not completed mandatory 240 days. Therefore, his claim is liable to be dismissed.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 23-6-2000 :—

1. Whether the services of the petitioner has been terminated in view of the Industrial Disputes Act ? OP
2. Relief.

FINDINGS

6. **ISSUE NO-1.**—Petitioner has come into the witness box in support of his case, whereas on behalf of the respondent, Shri R. S. Marwah, S. D. O. Electrical Sub-Division, Rajgarh has appeared in the Court. The details of working days in respect of the petitioner has been filed, which shows that he worked for 135 days from 21-7-1981 to 20-12-1981. According to the respondent except for these days, petitioner never worked for the Electricity Board as per the record maintained by them. On the other hand petitioner has not been able to produce any record though he asserted in the Court that he worked continuously from 1980 to 1983. However, his statement alone is not sufficient to prove his claim. Therefore, I have no hesitation to hold that petitioner has not completed 240 days in any calendar year and has only worked for 135 days during the year, 1981.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that as per the certified standing orders, petitioner was entitled to a 10 days notice even if he has not completed 240 days. So his termination is bad in law. The Certified standing orders which have been placed on record by both the parties have come into force on 5-6-1985, whereas even as per the petitioner's own showing he was terminated much prior to this date. So, these standing orders are not applicable in case of the petitioner.

8. The petitioner has admitted that except orally approaching the concerned officers, he did not make any representation for more than a decade. The reference has been received in this Court in 1998, whereas the cause of action has arisen in 1981. In these circumstances, the objection of the respondent that the cause of action is ancient cannot also be ignored. Moreover since the petitioner has not completed 240 days, so, he was not entitled to any notice or notice pay. Certified standing orders are also not applicable in his case. Therefore, petitioner has failed to prove his case and the issue is decided accordingly against the petitioner.

RELIEF

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief and the reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Announced in the open Court today this 21st Day of July, 2001.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor Presiding Judge
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

R.f. No. 34/1996.

Instituted : on 4-4-1996

Decided on : 31-7-2001

1. Shri Amin Chand son of Shri Mahant Ram, r/o Village, Dharoda, P. O. Mera Masit, Tehsil Shundernagar, District Mandi, Himchal Pradesh.
2. Shri Satish Kumar, V. P.O. Sujanpur, Pathankot, District Gurdaspur, Punjab.
3. Shri Pargat Singh son of Shri Raghubir Singh, V. P.O. Bharat, via Harchowl, District Gurdaspur, Punjab.
4. Shri Labh Singh son of Shri Teja Singh, V. P.O. Balpurian, Tehsil Beedala, District Gurdaspur, Punjab.
5. Shri Lal Singh son of Shri Roop Singh, V. P. O. Bhagwadadwara, Tehsil Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh.
6. Shri Keshav Ram son of Shri Ram Bhaj, Village Lower Bhattu, P. O. Upper Bhattu, Tehsil Baijnath, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.
7. Sh. Ravinder Kumar V.P.O. Rattanpur, District Chamba, Himachal Pradesh.

Versus

8. Shri Deepak Kumar son of Shri Mohinder Sharma Village Bhanana, P. O. Kirti, Tehsil Kumarsain, District Shimla. Himachal Pradesh Petitioners.

Versus

M/s Continental Foundation Joint Venture Nathpa Jhakri Project Sohding, Bhabanagar, Kinnaur, Himachal Pradesh through its Manager

.. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For petitioners: Shri Hem Raj, AR.

For respondent: Shri Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference was received from the appropriate Government :—

"Whether the termination of services of the workers as per list enclosed by the Management of M/s Continental Foundation Joint Venture, Sohding, Bhabanagar District Kinnaur, H. P. from the dates shown against their names is legal and justified, if not, to what relief and service benefits, the workmen are entitled to?"

2. Enclosed list of the workers shows that 8 workers were terminated on different dates by the Continental Foundation Joint Venture (CFJV) and a joint reference has been sent with regard to 8 workers who have been terminated on different charges and on different dates. Therefore, the claim petition which has been filed jointly by 8 workers deals with the claim of individual workers in different paras. However, Shri Hem Raj, who was representing the petitioners has mentioned in the written arguments filed by him that statement of claim has only been filed by petitioners S/ Shri Satish Kumar, Labh Singh, Lal Singh, Ravinder Kumar Keshav Ram and Deepak Kumar, and though Amin Chand has signed the petition, but he has not come forward to prove the case, whereas one Shri Lal Singh who though has not signed the statement of claim, but has appeared in the witness box. Another petitioner Shri Pragat Singh has neither signed the petition nor has stepped in the witness box in support of his case. Therefore, Shri Hem Raj has made submissions only on behalf of petitioners Satish Kumar, Lal Singh, Labh Singh, Ravinder Kumar, Keshav Ram and Deepak Kumar.

3. The facts with regard to these persons can be enumerated as follows :—

4. Shri Satish Kumar joined CFJV on 7-9-1994 and he was dismissed on 12-1-1996. It is contended that a complaint was made against him. Petitioner No. 4 Labh Singh was appointed as pipe fitter on 19-11-1994 as daily wage and subsequently he was regularised on 1-2-1995. He was also served a show cause notice on 23-9-1995 and after holding enquiry against him, he was dismissed on 23-11-1995. It is contended that he being executive member of the union was victimized by the respondent.

5. Petitioner Shri Lal Singh was appointed as HMV Driver on daily wages basis in July, 1994 and was regularised on 27-1-1995 and he was also served a show cause notice on 23-9-1995 on baseless grounds allegedly.

6. It is further alleged that petitioner No. 6 Shri Keshav Ram was appointed as Driver and worked as such till 16-11-1995. Likewise petitioner No. 7 Shri Ravinder Kumar was appointed as operator on 22-6-1995 and worked till 11-1-1996 and then they were terminated without any reason and lastly Shri Deepak Kumar was appointed on 1-2-1995 and was disengaged/terminated on 21-10-1995.

7. It is submitted that petitioners No. 1 to 8 have been dismissed from service in an illegal manner. Neither they were served with any notice nor they were paid any retrenchment compensation. It is also submitted that petitioner No. 2 to 6 and 8 have been dismissed on baseless charges. Documents were not supplied to them at all and the opportunity of being heard was not given to them. It is also contended that they have been dismissed to scuttle their Trade Union rights. It is also submitted that termination orders are non speaking and punishment is harsh and excessive.

8. In the reply filed by the respondent, it is contended that petitioners were their employees. However, their services were dispensed with in accordance with law and it had nothing to do with their Trade Union activities, if any.

9. It is contended that the reference regarding petitioner No. 1 is not maintainable. However, since Petitioner No. 1 has not pressed his claim, therefore, I need not go into the details with regard to Petitioner No. 1's allegations made in the petition.

10. As regards petitioner No. 2, it is contended that he was transferred from Badhal to Nathpa workshop. He refused to take the test for welding in heavy equipment and then a complaint was received against him, according to which he had misbehaved with one Shri Chain Ram Cook. On the basis of this complaint notice was issued to the petitioner and he was given the charge sheet. After considering his reply, a domestic enquiry was ordered and the petitioner was duly informed. He was also provided legal representative/Defence Assistant to help him in the proceedings. He was given opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses examined against him and his statements were also recorded. Proper opportunity was given to him and after considering the report of the enquiry, his services were terminated.

11. As regard Petitioner No. 3 against Shri Pargat Singh has neither signed the claim nor appeared in the witness box in support of his claim. Therefore, I need not to discuss the facts regarding the claim of Petitioner No. 3 in details. Suffice to say that as per report his termination is legal and in accordance with law.

12. As regards petitioner No. 4 Shri Labh Singh, it was contended that he was appointed as Fitter but his services were never regularised. He was served with a show cause notice and the enquiry was held against him. He was found guilty of the charges and was dismissed from service. It is contended that petitioner No. 4 was a habitual absentee and on 23-9-1995 a complaint was received against him from Shri Sarwan Singh

Security Guard and Birbal operator (Loader) that they were beaten by some persons and they recognized petitioners No. 4 & 5 as two of the assaultants. Both the petitioners, 4 & 5 were offered opportunity of filing the replies, to the notice and the replies were not found satisfactory and so enquiry was conducted. Petitioner No. 4 as well as the Respondent Management adduced the evidence before the Enquiry Officer and the enquiry report was submitted. After consideration of the enquiry report, petitioner No. 4 was found guilty and his services were dispensed with on 21-11-1995. It is also contended that petitioner had been appointed only for a period of 12 months and had been placed on probation initially for six months and he was only to be confirmed by a specific letter, otherwise he was to remain on deemed probation. It is further contended that his services were never confirmed and he remained on probation and so his service could have been terminated even without holding any enquiry.

13. As regards petitioner No 5, it is submitted that he was appointed on 11-1-1995 and was never regularised. On a complaint a show cause notice was issued against him, that he was found in a drunken state and was found sleeping inside the tunnel. Again another complaint was received from Swaranjit Singh and Birbal regarding the alleged beating by him and Petitioner No. 4 alongwith few other persons. Show cause notices were served on them and thereafter enquiry was held, in which he was given opportunity to defend himself and as per the enquiry report, he was found guilty and so his services were terminated. Again it is contended that he being still on probation, his services could be terminated without even holding any enquiry against him.

14. Petitioner No. 6 Shri Keshav Ram was allegedly appointed as Driver on 24-4-1995. He was deputed for going to Delhi for the company work and on coming back, he submitted bills of Sudesh Guest House Paharganj, Delhi for staying in the said Guest House from 7-9-1995 to 9-9-1995. The bills were found to be forged and a show cause notice was issued to him. The petitioner submitted the reply and enquiry was conducted. The petitioner admitted the charges framed against him and submitted that he will not repeat the act in future. Since petitioner admitted his guilt, and was found to have been guilty of misconduct so his services were terminated. Again it is contended that Petitioner No. 6 was on probation and his services could have been terminated without assigning any reasons.

15. Petitioner No. 7 Sh. Ravinder Kumar is stated to have been appointed on 22-6-1995 and he was on probation and his services could only be regularised by a written letter of confirmation and no such confirmation was done in his case. However, he was found drunk and quarrelling on 8-1-1996. He also misbehaved with another employee Shri Som Nath Chakravorti under the influence of liquor. He was also found absent from his duties and since he was still on probation and his work was not found satisfactory so his services were terminated. No show cause notice was required to be served on him.

16. Lastly with regard to Petitioner No. 8 it is contended that he proceeded on leave without any prior approval. He also did not resume his duties and he moved another application for extension of his leave. The leave was however not granted and he was communicated about the refusal of the leave and he was directed to join duties. It is submitted that as per the Certified Standing Orders of the Company, he was given a notice that if he did not join the duties, disciplinary action would be taken against him and since petitioner did not join the duties, another letter dated 9-10-95 was sent to him which he was directed to join by 16-10-95. He did not join even up till 16-10-95 and so as per the Certified Standing Orders, it was assumed that he had abandoned the job and his services stood terminated on 21-10-1995. It is also contended that his services could be terminated at any time without holding any enquiry as he was on probation.

17. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 23-7-1997:—

1. Whether the termination/dismissal of services of the petitioner is illegal invalid and not justifiable on the grounds as alleged? OPP.
2. Relief.

FINDINGS

18. *Issue No. 1.*—First of all, the case of Petitioner No. 2 Shri Satish Kumar is taken up for consideration. Shri Satish Kumar has stepped in the witness box as PW-1 and has mentioned that he was falsely implicated in a case of beating a co-worker named Chain Ram. He further mentioned that though an enquiry was conducted against him after he replied to the charge-sheet, but he was not provided with the copies of the evidence led in the enquiry. He was also not given full opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses. He was also not supplied the copies of the enquiry report nor any show cause notice was given to him before his dismissal. He has also mentioned that he did not take up the test of Welder of heavy machines because he had already qualified it earlier and he was asked to appear for this test after one year of continuous service. He has also mentioned that he got the charge-sheet EX. RB and submitted his reply vide EX. RC. He was also permitted a Defence Assistant vide EX. RE. He has also mentioned that his statement was recorded during the enquiry.

19. The contention of the petitioner is that the complaint made by Chain Ram was false and there were contradictions in the statement of Chain Ram and the other witnesses examined on behalf of the complainant. Still the Enquiry Officer held him guilty without appreciating the contradictions and so the enquiry was not fair. It is also submitted that the copy of the complaint on the basis of which he was charge-sheeted was not supplied to him. Further that the enquiry proceedings copy of the enquiry report and second show cause notice were not supplied to him. Therefore, the enquiry is not proper and fair and his services could not have been terminated on the basis of this enquiry.

20. The charge-sheet served on petitioner No. 2 reads as under:—

"It has been reported against you that on 1-11-95 at about 8.30 A.M., you came to worker mess and asked for breakfast from Mr. Chain Ram cook, who was on duty. He replied you that you were not dining member of that mess still he provided you breakfast after finishing breakfast he asked you to pay money for the same. Due to this you got angry and caught hold of his collar and has beaten him".

21. It is submitted that the contents of charges shows that petitioner No. 2 was not the dining member of the mess that Chain Ram did not know him. Whereas on the complaint EX R-1, itself a not has been given that petitioner No. 2 has been transferred from Badhal site which means that Chain Ram was aware that he is an employee and was known to him. It is submitted that despite such knowledge, Chain Ram refused to serve the Break-fast to him, which shows the malafides and also belies the contentions of the complainant. Another argument which has been raised by the petitioner is that the statement of Chain Ram itself is full of contradictions in the examination in chief and in the cross-examination. As in the examination in chief, though he was mentioned the date of incident to be 1-11-1995, but while in the cross-examination, he mentioned that he does not remember the date. Further in examination in chief, he has mentioned that he was slapped and taken outside, but in the cross-examination to a specific question as to whether he got injuries, he has mentioned that he was caught from the Collor and if he had not been rescued, he could have been liquidated. Further that there is another contradiction in his statement in chief and cross-examination because in the examination in chief, he mentioned that he told

the petitioner to wait and that he will give him breakfast after some time, whereas in the cross-examination, he mentioned that he had told that petitioner that he will not get the breakfast. It is contended that statement of Cook Chain Ram being full of contradictions does not inspire confidence, but has been relied by the Enquiry Officer. It is also stated that his statement is contradicted by PW-2 Achru Ram, who has mentioned that petitioner informed Chain Ram that he is a guest of Shri Paras Ram and thereafter, petitioner brought Chain Ram from the Kitchen and manhandled. According to the petitioner, statement of Achru Ram is entirely different than that of Chain Ram himself as the mention of Paras Ram has not been made by Chain Ram at all.

22. The statement of PW-2 before the Enquiry Officer however, is to the effect that it was he who was given beatings and refused the meals. It is further mentioned by him that he was an activist of CITU whereas, the complainant and the witnesses are affiliated to INTUC and so he has been falsely implicated.

23. The evidence which has come on record does not seem to have been properly appreciated by the Enquiry Officer. There are material contradictions in the statement of complainant, in examination in chief and cross-examination and also between the statement of Chain Ram and Achru Ram. The contradictions show that account given by both these witnesses contradict each other to the extent that it is not possible to ascertain as to how the actual occurrence took place i.e. whether it took place inside the kitchen or outside. Secondly, whether it was only for the payment of mess charges in cash or whether the name of one Paras Ram was also mentioned and petitioner claimed to be the guest of Shri Paras Ram and it is also not clear whether the petitioner only held the collar of Chain Ram or whether he also gave him a slap. Therefore, the evidence which has come on record does not prove the contentions of the charge-sheet beyond reasonable suspicion. The law is quite well settled that the evidence before the Enquiry officer can be re-assessed and appreciated by the Court and by such re-assessment and re-appreciation of the evidence, I am of the firm view that the charges levelled against petitioner No. 2 are not proved on the basis of the evidence which has been led before the Enquiry Officer.

Even otherwise the copy of the complaint has not been supplied to the petitioner and though it is submitted that the complaint was not relied upon during the enquiry, but infact the entire enquiry revolves around document Ex.R-2. Therefore, it was material document and was required to be supplied to the petitioner and the petitioner could have taken the advantage of contradiction between the complaint and the charge-sheet which he could not do for want of the document and it has caused prejudice to him. Lastly, admittedly the enquiry report and second show cause notice were not given to the petitioner. Learned Counsel for the respondent has however, mentioned that it is being only a domestic enquiry, no such notice was required to be given to the petitioner. He has also submitted in the written arguments filed by him that enquiry proceedings were made available to him and the petitioner has put his signatures in token of receiving the same. It is submitted that as per the Certified standing orders, no second show cause notice was required to be given. Therefore, the enquiry does not suffer from any infirmity.

24. I do not subscribe to this view of the learned counsel of the respondent. The rule of natural justice and equity demands that after the enquiry is completed, the copy of the enquiry report is supplied to the petitioner so that he can represent against the proposed penalty especially when non supply of such copy will prejudice the case of the petitioner. In this case, such opportunity has not been given to the petitioner. I am supported in my view by 1999-Lab. IP.C. 308. Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that disciplinary proceedings is a quasi-judicial proceeding and it attracts the provisions of natural justice. Further that the delinquent has a right to have the findings of guilt and proposed punishment intimated to him before he is punished. It

is also mentioned that this right of the petitioner is not lost even after the 42nd amendment as rules of natural justice are not affected by 42nd amendment.

25. In view of this discussion above, I hold that the termination of Petitioner No. 2 Shri Satish Kumar is illegal and unjustified.

26. Now coming to the case of Shri Labh Singh, petitioner No. 4 in the claim petition. His allegations are that he was appointed on 12-1-1995 and then a show cause notice was served on him, which was duly replied by him. However, enquiry was ordered as the management was not satisfied with his reply and on the basis of the enquiry report, he was dismissed from service on 21-11-1995. The contention of the petitioner is that he was not issued any charge-sheet. Further that show cause notice was issued to him on the basis of the complaint made by one Shri Sawaranjeet and Birbal and though the complaint filed by Shri Swaranjeet does not have any allegations against him, but it has been made part of the allegations contained in the show cause notice, which was issued to him, which shows that there was no application of mind by the respondent.

27. Further Swaranjeet did not utter a single word against him when he appeared before the Enquiry Officer. Hence, the allegations of bearings of Swaranjeet and Birbal are not proved before the Enquiry Officer, yet he was dismissed from service on these allegations.

28. He further contended that Shri Birbal is member of a separate organisation and even he has not directly accused Labh Singh of any beatings. Lastly, it is contended that no report of enquiry was sent to him before he was given punishment. List of witnesses likely deposition of the witnesses before the Enquiry officer and other documents were also not provided. Hence he was denied reasonable opportunity to defend himself. Therefore, he is liable to be re-instated and the order of dismissal is liable to be quashed.

29. The submissions of the respondent on the other hand are that a valid enquiry was conducted. Sufficient opportunity was provided by the management to the delinquent to defend himself. Further that petitioner was on probation of six months and had not been confirmed by a specific letter. So his services could even be terminated without holding any enquiry. Other contention of the respondent is that there is no specific pleadings regarding the arguments now being raised. Therefore, they cannot be looked into. It is also contended that no documents as such were relied upon by the management. Hence it is argued that there was no compulsion to supply any documents. Lastly, that the enquiry was conducted in accordance with the Certified standing orders and no second show cause notice was required to be given in the domestic enquiry. Hence, contention of the petitioner requires to be rejected.

30. After going through the statement of Shri Labh Singh and RW-1 and after considering the written submissions of the parties, it is apparent that no formal charge-sheet was served, the copies of the documents and the list of witnesses were also not supplied though petitioner was provided with a Defence Assistant. He cross-examined the witnesses of the management. Lastly that enquiry report was not supplied to the petitioner.

31. The contention of the management that there was no need to supply documents as they were not specifically relied upon, does not appear to be correct. The show cause, notice has been issued on the basis of the complaint which was therefore, the integral part of the show cause notice. Moreover admittedly enquiry report was not sent to petitioner before the punishment was awarded. The argument of the learned counsel for the respondent that as per the Certified Standing Orders, there was no need of sending the enquiry report in domestic inquiry cannot also be accepted in view of the Decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

case 1999-Lab. I. C. 308 because the ratio of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court is that principles of natural justice should not be offended while dealing with the matters concerning the services of an employee and employee is required to be given full opportunity to explain and represent his stand. I, therefore, hold that principles of natural justice has been offended by non supply of the enquiry report to the petitioner.

32. Another argument of the respondent is that petitioner was on deemed probation. So his service could be dispensed with a even without holding an enquiry. Again since the dismissal is stigmatic in character and has been ordered on account of a misconduct, therefore, it is not a case of termination simplicitor for not completing the probation period satisfactorily. Therefore, enquiry was required to be done and charges were required to be proved in accordance with law, which has not been done. Lastly, the argument of the learned counsel for the respondent that the evidence and submissions of the petitioner are beyond pleadings and therefore, cannot be looked into can also not be accepted. Disputes before the Labour Court and Industrial Tribunal can not be at par with the civil suit and the strict compliance of the provisions of CPC is not required to be made in these cases. Therefore, the argument of the learned counsel for the respondent are rejected and I hold that termination of Labh Singh is against law and is liable to be set-aside.

33. Lal Singh petitioner has been numbered as petitioner No. 5. In fact the allegations against him and Shri Labh Singh are similar and both of them are accused of giving beatings to Swaranjeet and Balbir. The contention of the petitioner in this case are similar to that of Labh Singh, mainly that no charge-sheet was served, list of witnesses and the documents were not supplied and copy of the enquiry report was not supplied to him. Similar submissions have been made by the respondents as in case of Labh Singh that evidence and submissions are beyond pleadings, that Lal Singh was on probation and there was no requirement of sending the enquiry report in view of the certified standing orders. Suffice to say that matter already stands discussed above in case of Labh Singh. I hold that for the same reasons dismissal of Lal Singh cannot be held to be in accordance with law. I, therefore, hold that dismissal of Lal Singh is liable to be set-aside.

34. Now coming to the case of Keshav Ram, it is contended that Keshav Ram who was engaged as Driver had submitted forged bills of his stay in guest house in Delhi when he was on tour. The contention of the petitioner is that though enquiry was conducted but the statement of the petitioner was not recorded nor the witnesses of the management were examined. He has further mentioned that he came to know about the enquiry, only during the proceedings of the case in the courts. The submission of the respondent on the other hand is that a show cause notice was issued to Keshav Ram with regard to submission of false bill and he admitted his guilt before the Enquiry officer. Therefore, in view of his pleading guilty to the acquisition, he was dismissed from service as he admitted having committed a grave misconduct. It is also contended by respondent that validity of his admission before the Enquiry Officer has not been challenged by Keshav Ram and same is exhibited as RW-5/B.

35. Statement of Keshav Ram which is recorded in the Court shows that he was not supplied with the copies of the statements of the witnesses, copy of the complaint and enquiry report. He has mentioned that company levelled false charges against him regarding submitting false TA Bills. He has admitted the enquiry report is RW-5/B and the notice/charge-sheet is Ex. RW-5/A. Now document Ex. RW-5/B bears signatures of Keshav Ram on all the three pages. He has also signed the endorsement written by Enquiry Officer, which is reproduced as follows :—

“मुझे गलती तो मन्ज़ूर ही है और महाशय से अनुरोध है कि हमें माफ़ किया जाये भविष्य में ऐसी गलती नहीं करेंगे।”
While appearing in the witness box in the examination

in-chief he has not explained why he signed on this admission if according to him, the allegations were not true. He has admitted that Ex. PW-5/B was prepared, however he has not explained why he signed the endorsement if it was not true. He has not even alleged that he was forced to sign on these documents or that they were not read over to him. So this document shows that when notices of acquisition was read over to him, he pleaded guilty and therefore, there was no reason to hold any further enquiry in view of his admission. Admission is the best proof and admitted facts need not be proved by leading separate evidence. So in view of this admission of Keshav Ram, which is not challenged by him at all, I hold that the charge against him stands proved and since this is a grave misconduct as per the certified standing orders, therefore, punishment cannot be said to be harsh or excessive. Forgery of TA bills is a serious misconduct and I do not think that it will be proper to interfere in the punishment awarded to the petitioner.

36. Next is the case of Shri Ravinder Kumar. He was appointed on 22-6-1995 and was terminated on 11-1-1996. It is contended that his service were not found satisfactory and so he was terminated. The contention of the petitioner Ravinder Kumar is that he was appointed as Loader operator and two complaints were allegedly received against him. He has however submitted that these complaints were filed much prior to his termination and no action should have been taken at a belated stage on these complaints. Further that no charge-sheet was served on him though a warning letter was served on him. His contention is that since serving of warning letter caste stigma on him, therefore a full fledged enquiry was required to be conducted and though the letter of termination is apparently for not completing the probation period satisfactorily, but he was terminated on the basis of some complaints without affording him any opportunity of defending himself. It is also stated that even otherwise provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 were required to be complied with, which was not done. Shri Ravinder Kumar has also come to the witness box and has mentioned that no enquiry was conducted against him nor any chargesheet was served upon him. Further that he did not receive any formal letter of confirmation and letter Ex. RW-4/B was got signed by him. Statement of RW-1 Shri Vijay Singh with regard to Ravinder Kumar is to the effect that a complaint was received against petitioner who was on probation and Shri Ravinder Kumar admitted his fault. A warning was issued to him and then a show cause notice was served on him. However, since his service during the probation period was not found satisfactory and so he was terminated. The documents which have been appended with regard to Ravinder Kumar are Ex. RW-4/A to RW-4/C. The Ex. RW-4/A shows that petitioner was appointed on 17-5-1995 and RW-4/C shows that he was terminated on 11-1-1996. The most relevant document is Ex. RW-4/B, which is a letter allegedly written by Shri Ravinder Kumar and signed by him and in this letter he has admitted certain misbehaviour done by him with one Shri Som Nath Chakaraverty when he was under the influence of liquor. However, he has asked for forgiveness by this letter. The letter of termination which has been issued after 4/5 months of Ex. RW-4/B does not have any mention of any misconduct of the petitioner and is a letter of termination simplicitor mentioning that the service of the petitioner are not required any longer. Further from these documents it appears that though during the probation period, petitioner was found guilty of some misconduct, but in view of his admission and request for forgiveness, no further action was taken against him. Petitioner continued to serve on probation for another 4/5 months. However, before his probation period was completed, he was terminated vide letter Ex. RW-4/C. In these circumstances, it cannot be inferred that he was punished for the alleged misconduct on 18-7-1995. Had it been so, he could have been terminated on that day itself or some enquiry could have been ordered against him. It seems that management accepted the plea of forgiving him and continued him in the job and then he was terminated vide Ex. RW-

4/C for non completion of his probation.....period satisfactorily or for.....not requiring his service any longer. Document Ex. RW-4/A vide which petitioner was appointed, clearly stipulates that petitioner could be terminated from service during probation period without assigning any reasons. In the circumstances, I hold that even the back drop of the termination of the petitioner does not suggest that he has been punished for some misconduct under the guise of his not completing the probation period satisfactorily. I, therefore, hold that termination of petitioner Shri Ravinder Kumar does not suffer from any defects.

37. Lastly coming to the case of Shri Deepak Kumar, the allegations against him are that he remained absent without leave for a period of more than 10 days and though letters were issued to him on the address supplied by him, but he failed to join the duties. Therefore, in view of the Certified Standing Orders, he being absent for more than the prescribed period, lost his lien on the job and his termination was automatic. Argument of the management is that principles of natural justice were complied with by sending him repeated intimations. The contention of Deepak Kumar is that he had applied for leave, which was sanctioned in his favour. However, when he came back to join the duties, he was terminated from service. Statement of Shri Deepak Kumar can be referred to in this regard. He has appeared as PW-6. He has mentioned that he was dismissed from service on false allegations of being absent though he had proceeded on sanctioned leave. He has mentioned that though he was appointed on 4-4-1995, appointment letter was issued to him only on 1-2-1995. He has admitted his signatures on Ex. RW-6/B, but it has been mentioned that dates have been interpolated by the respondent. According to him, he proceeded on leave on 22-10-1995 and had submitted the application 4/5 days prior to the date, but the respondent has interpolated the date. He has mentioned that he has studied upto +2. He denied that he submitted the application on the day when he proceeded on leave or that he had only obtained one day authorised leave. He has denied that he received the letters sent to him.

38. Shri Fojdar RW-1. has mentioned that petitioner Deepak Kumar submitted his application for leave, but it was not sanctioned. Then he absented from duty and his absence was reported by the Manager. He was issued notice through registered post to join the duties, but he did not do so. He further has mentioned that letters were issued to him on the address given by the petitioner on the leave application and when he did not join the duties despite notices, he was terminated in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders. He has mentioned that the letters which were sent to him were received back undelivered though they were sent on the address given by the petitioner on the leave application. He has also admitted in the cross-examination that letters sent to Deepak Kumar were received back with the endorsement that the address was not complete.

39. The evidence and record which has been produced show that leave of Deepak Kumar was not sanctioned by the management and he was sent certain letters to report back. The letters were sent on the address given by him but they were received undelivered with the endorsement that the address is not complete. It shows that the letters sent by the management could not be delivered to the petitioner and he was unaware about the directions and the intimations of the management that his leave has been refused. No doubt, the address was furnished by the petitioner himself, yet, factually these letters were not received by him. Since petitioner remained absent un-authorisedly as per the management, it was required that petitioner should have been given an opportunity of explaining his conduct before he is terminated from service, especially when the letter sent to him were received back undelivered. Petitioner admittedly reported back after availing the leave, but no show cause notice was issued to him thereafter. No doubt, as per the Certified Standing Orders after a particular period of absence, lien on job is lost, but any such rule of Certified Standing Orders has to be in accordance with the principles of natural justice, which required that before dismissing him, he should have been afforded an opportunity of being heard, which admittedly was not done. Therefore, the dismissal/termination of Deepak Kumar is not in accordance with law and is liable to be set aside. Hence the issue is decided accordingly.

RELIEF

40. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the termination of petitioner No. 1 & 3 who have not signed the claim petition nor have appeared in the witness box, is justified. Hence, their claim fails. As regards Petitioners Satish Kumar, Labh Singh, Lal Singh and Deepak Kumar, their termination/dismissal is illegal and I order their re-instatement with full back wages and seniority as per law. As regards petitioners Keshav Ram and Ravinder Kumar, they have failed to establish their contentions, so their claim is rejected. Therefore, the reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to appropriate Government for its publication.

Announced in the Open Court today this 31st day of July, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla-2.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge, H.P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 57 of 1997

Instituted on 21-4-1997

Decided on 8-8-2001

1. Prem Chand son of Shri Bhadur Chand, House No. 24, Ward No. 8, Nalagarh, District Solan. 2. Lajja Ram son of Shri Maghi Ram, Village Sobarmajra, P.O. Panjaira, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan
..Petitioners.

Versus

M/s Tissue and Fibres Ltd., Goljamala, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan, H.P. through its General Manager
.. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, AR.

For respondent : ex-parte.

AWARD :

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government, in which following two points have been framed for adjudication:—

(1) Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Prem Chand and Lajja Ram by the management of M/s Tissue and Fibres Ltd., Golajmala, Barotiwala, District Solan (H. P.) w.e.f. 18-7-1995 is legal maintainable, if not to what relief, S/Shri Prem Chand Lajja Ram are entitled?

(2) Whether the enquiry conducted by the management is fair and proper, if not, its effect?

2. In the claim petition filed by the petitioners, it is submitted that they were appointed in April, 1984, but the appointment letters were issued to them on 1-4-1985 when they completed one year of their service. It is further submitted that there was a dispute between the respondent and M/s Ganesh Rice Mills and the petitioners were summoned as witnesses by M/s Ganesh Rice Mills to prove some vouchers/receipts, which had been issued by the petitioners as the employees of the respondent. However, the respondent wanted them to deny these facts, which the petitioners could not do as they had received the material and given the receipts. Since the petitioners could not deny these documents, therefore, the management got annoyed with them and cooked a false charge against them. Charge-Sheet was served on them on 10-3-1995 and one Shri Rajeev Sharma

Advocate conducted the enquiry though he was not appointed as the Enquiry Officer properly. It is also submitted that Mr. Rajeev Sharma was also prejudiced against them and so a mock enquiry was conducted in which petitioners participated under duress. It is submitted that petitioners were not show any documents nor were supplied the enquiry proceedings. They were also not given the enquiry report. They were also not given proper opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses. It is submitted that compliance of Section 25-N of the Industrial Disputes Act was also not made and they were not given any opportunity of being heard before imposing the major penalty of dismissal. Hence, the domestic enquiry which was conducted against them be declared null and void and their dismissal be set-aside.

3. Despite opportunities, respondent failed to appear in the Court and was proceeded against *ex-parte*. *Ex-parte* evidence was led by the petitioners and both the petitioners have stepped into the witness box and also proved documents Ex. P-1 to Ex. P-14. Ex. P-1 is the appointment letter of petitioner No. 1 and Ex. P-2 is that of Lajja Ram Ex. P-3, P-4 are the summons issued by the Court of learned Sub-Judge, Nalagarh for their appearance as witness in a case of M/s Gansh Rice Mills Vs. M/s Tissue & Fibres. Ex. P-5 and Ex. P-6 are the charge-sheets issued to both the petitioners Ex. P-7 and Ex. P-8 are the replies submitted by them, Ex. P-9 and Ex. P-10 are the second show cause notice. Ex. P-11 and Ex. P-12 are the dismissal orders of both the petitioners.

4. In view of the un-rebutted statement of both the petitioners and documents, which are annexed hereto and are not challenged, it appears that both the petitioners were summoned in the Court of Learned Sub-Judge, Nalagarh in a case involving the respondent. The documents show that charge-sheet was given and was replied to by the petitioners. However, neither the enquiry proceedings are on record, nor there is any thing to show that the petitioners were given the opportunity to prove their innocence. There is nothing on record to show that enquiry report was given to them alongwith the second show cause notice to afford them the opportunity to speak on the punishment to be awarded to them. So, the unrebutted *ex-parte* evidence which has come on record shows that the procedure adopted by the Enquiry Officer was not fair and legal and hence the enquiry conducted against them is vitiated and is liable to be set-aside. I also hold that since the enquiry was not proper and legal, therefore, the termination of the petitioners is not legal and therefore, they are entitled to be re-instated in service with full back wages and full back seniority from the date of alleged termination. The reference is, therefore, answered *ex-parte* in favour of the petitioners and against the respondent. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the H. P. Rajpatra.

Announced in the Open Court today this 8th day of August, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour, Court Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 66 of 1999

Instituted on : 6-4-99

Decided on : 14-8-2001

Shri Sant Ram son of Shri Sher Singh, r/o Village &
P. O. Tityana, Tehsil Kamrou, District Sirmaur, H. P.
.. Petitioner.

Versus

1. State of H. P. through Secretary (Forests) to the
Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

2. D. F. O. Renuka, District Sirmaur, H. P.

3. Range Officer, Kaffota, District Sirmaur, H. P.
.. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, AR.

For respondent : Shri B. R. Sharma, AR.

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government. In the claim petition filed by the petitioner, it is alleged that his services were terminated by the respondent in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is contended that he was working as beldar in the office of the Range Officer, Kaffota, from 1992 to 1997 and has further mentioned that his record regarding employment is laying the office of the Divisional Forest Officer, Paonta. Petitioner has alleged that juniors have been retained by the respondent, while his services have been terminated and the provisions of Section 25-H, B and 25-G have also been violated. It is alleged that he was not been given any notice. Petitioner has referred to number of judgements with regard to the violation of Section 25F in the petition itself. It is also contended that since his retrenchment is contrary to law, so he may be re-engaged with all consequential benefits.

2. In the reply filed by the respondent, preliminary objection has been raised that petitioner only worked from 1992 to 1994 on daily wages on seasonal forestry work and thereafter, he left the work of his own. It is also contended that during the period from 1992 to 1994, he never completed 240 days in any of the calendar year. Therefore, compliance of Section 25-F of the act is not at all required. Hence, the petitioner is not maintainable. It is also contended that petitioner is estopped by his own acts and conducts from filing the present petition. There is no cause of action and petition is barred by limitation.

3. On merits, it is contended that 240 days have not been completed by the petitioner in any of the calendar year. Further that he left the job on his own. Lastly that petitioner was only employed as daily wager on seasonal forestry work and is not entitled to the claim.

4. On the pleading of the parties, the following issues were framed on 2-6-2000 :-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioner is in contravention of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act as alleged? If so its effect? OPP.
2. Whether the petition is not maintainable in view of the preliminary objection No. 1? OPR.
3. Relief.

FINDINGS

5. Issue No. 1. The petitioner while appearing in the witness box has admitted that he does not remember the exact period of his employment with the respondent. However, that persons junior to him like Inder Singh and Kundan Singh are still in the employment. In the cross-examination, he has denied that he has not completed 240 days in the calendar year or that he abandoned the job himself. He however, admitted that he left the job in 1994 and then corrected himself that he was retrenched.

6. The respondent has examined Shri Bhagwati Parsad, Range Officer, Kaffota in support of his case. He has brought the record as per EX. RA., which is the mandays chart. Petitioner has worked for 64 days in 1992, 227 days in 1993 and 80 days in 1994, though this period has been calculated on the basis of calendar year, but even if 12 continuous months are taken into

consideration, during this period 240 days have never been completed by the petitioner. Though the petitioner has given a suggestion to the respondent that EX. RA is not correct, but, no contrary record has been produced by him nor it is shown as to how the record is not correct or properly maintained. Petitioner has relied upon one document Mark-A, which is a copy of EX. RA, except that there are some cuttings and additions in this document, this document is similar and also shows that petitioner has not completed 240 days during any period of 12 months. It also shows that the claim of the petitioner that he worked from 1992 to 1997 is not correct.

7. Since the record which has been placed by both the parties, does not prove that petitioner has completed 240 days in any calendar year, so, petitioner is not entitled to any benefits under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

8. There is also no evidence on record to show that the persons junior to the petitioner have been deployed and the seniority has been violated in any manner. Moreover, petitioner has not completed 240 days. Therefore, he is not entitled to any benefits. Hence, the issue is decided against the petitioner.

9. *Issue No. 2.*—Preliminary objection regarding the maintainability etc., have been raised. However, limitation act is not applicable to the disputes arising under the Industrial Disputes Act. Moreover, there is no lacuna as regard the maintainability of the petition. Hence, the preliminary objections are devoid of any force and are decided against the respondent.

RELIEF

10. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, the reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the H. P. Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today this 14th day of August, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 51 of 1997

Instituted on 2-4-1997

Decided on 16-8-2001

1. Shri Sunil Datt son of Shri Shiva Nand, Village Kamahan, P. O. Gagal, Tehsil Pachhad, District Sirmaur.
2. Shri Ram Singh son of Shri Man Bahadur, Village Oiliwala, P. O. & Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
3. Shri Raj Kumar son of Shri Dasondi Ram, Village Bankala P. O. Sainwala Tehsil Nahan.
4. Shri Jag Pal son of Shri Krishan Lal, Village Mogi-Nand, P. O. Moginand, Tehsil Nahan.
5. Shri Mangat Ram son of Shri Swaroop Singh, Village Talone, Tehsil Nahan.
6. Shri Dault Ram son of Shri Kundan Singh, Village Jablog, P. O. Andheri, Tehsil Sangrah.
7. Shri Puran Chand son of Shri Bholar Village Jaglog, P. O. Sainj, Tehsil Sangrah.
8. Shri Sant Ram son of Shri Basti Ram, V. P. O. Bbalona, Tehsil Sangrah.
9. Shri Vijay Pal son of Shri Goman Singh, Village Jablog, P. O. Sainj, Tehsil Sangrah.
10. Shri Kamlesh Kumar son of Shri Ram Gopal, Village Malonwala Bhood, P. O. Shambuwala, Tehsil Nahan.

11. Shri Jeewan Singh son of Shri Roop Ram, Village Ludhiana, P. O. Andheri, Tehsil Sangrah.
12. Shri Dault Ram son of Shri Naktu Ram, V. P. O. Sagna, Tehsil Sangrah.
13. Shri Dharm Singh son of Shri Sher Singh, Village Fandi, Bodiwala, Tehsil Paonta.
14. Shri Gopal Chand son of Shri Tara Singh, Village Gulabgrah, P. O. Katri Bias, Tehsil Paonta.
15. Shri Ravinder Singh son of Shri Hira Singh, Village Sawad, P. O. Narag, Tehsil Pachhad.
16. Shri Jeet Singh son of Shri Salig Ram, Village Chorin Khetra, P. O. Narag, Tehsil Pachhad.
17. Shri Baldev Singh son of Shri Tula Ram, Village Sawad, P. O. Narag, Tehsil Pachhad.
18. Shri Khajan Singh son of Shri Joginder Singh, Village Kojtu, P. O. Narag, Tehsil Pachhad.
19. Shri Ram Pal son of Shri Mast Ram, Village Bagora, Post office Narag, Tehsil Pachhad.
20. Shri Naresh Kumar son of Shri Mohinder Singh, Village Tara pur, P. O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan.
21. Shri Balinder Singh son of Shri Sadhu Ram, Village Kaulawala Bhood, Tehsil Nahan.
22. Shri Hari Singh son of Shri Nandu Ram, Village & P. O. Katribias, Tehsil Paonta.
23. Shri Tikhu Ramson of Shri Jalam Singh, Village Biojang, P. O. Korag, Tehsil Sangrah.
24. Shri Sarwan Singh son of Shri Natbu Ram, Village Katola Dehar, Tehsil Nahan.
25. Shri Sumer Chand son of Shri Udai Ram, r/o Village Bankla, P. O. Sainwala, Tehsil Nahan

Petitioners,

Versus

Executive Engineer, Irrigation and Public Health
Division, Nahan District Sirmaur (H. P.)

Respondent

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For Petitioners: S/Shri A.K. Gupta & J.C. Bhardwaj.

For Respondent: Shri Mahesh Kumar.

AWARD

Following reference has been received from the appropriate Government :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Sunil Datt and 23 other workers (list enclosed) by the Executive Engineer, Irrigation and Public Health Division, Nahan, District Sirmaur (H. P.) without any notice, charge-sheet, enquiry and without compliance of section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, on completion of 240 days continuous service is legal and justified, if not, to what relief of service benefits including back wages, seniority and amount of compensation, the above aggrieved workmen are entitled to?"

2. Petitioners Raj Kumar and 12 others have filed a separate claim petition, whereas Daulat Ram and 8 others have filed separate but joint petition. Three petitioners i.e. petitioner No. 14, 20 and 22 have not filed the claim petition nor they have stepped into the witness box. Petitioners have alleged that they were employed by the respondent as per Annexure P-1, but their services were illegally terminated in violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is also contended the principle of first come last go has also not been adhered to. Hence that the petitioners are entitled to be re-instated with seniority and back wages. In the claim petition filed by Daulat Ram and 8 others, specific mention have been made of the date of joining and termination of the petitioners.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, by way of preliminary objections, it is contended, that petition is

hopelessly barred by limitation. Moreover that the services of the petitioners were not terminated by the respondent rather they left the job on their own and now the petition has been filed to get the benefit of the decision of Mool Raj v/s State of H. P.

4. On merits the individual petitioners working days chart has been produced in Para-I of the reply. It is also mentioned that since the petitioners left the job on their own, so there was no justification for complying with the principle of first come last go.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned Predecessor framed the following issues on 30-5-1998:—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioners in view of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified and the petitioners are entitled to the relief claimed in the petition *OPP.*

2. Relief.

FINDINGS

6. *Issue No. 1.*—Some of the petitioners namely S/Shri Tikhu Ram, Daulat Ram, Jeet Singh, Sunil and Dharam Singh have stepped into the witness box. These petitioners have maintained that they were employed by the respondent and were terminated without any notice or compensation though they had completed more than 240 days. Shri Tikhu Ram has stated that he joined the respondent in October, 1989 and was terminated in 1993 and he approached the Conciliation officer in the same year. Shri Daulat Ram has stated that he was engaged in August, 1994 and was terminated in November, 1995 without any notice or compensation. Similarly, Shri Jeet Singh has mentioned that he joined the respondent in December, 1992 and then again was given employment in January, 1993 and worked till April, 1993. Thereafter the work was not available and so he was retrenched. Shri Sunil Datt PW-4 has mentioned that he joined the respondent in February, 1987 and worked till 31-12-1987. Thereafter, again joined the respondent in December, 1996 and worked till February, 1997. Shri Dharm Singh has mentioned that he joined in 1985 and was terminated in 1987 after completing 23 months of the employment. The suggestions to them are that they abandoned the job themselves. Statements of these PWs except of Shri Jit Singh show that they had completed more than 240 days of employment in one calendar year.

7. The respondent in rebuttal has examined Shri Mahesh Sharma, Assistant Engineer. He has mentioned that as per the muster rolls and the working days chart, prepared by them, which is Ex. R-3 to Ex. R-25, most of the petitioners have not worked for 240 days in any calendar year. He has mentioned in the cross-examination that labourers were being engaged intermittently on the availability of the work. He also maintained that the work was available and it was the labourers, who left the job in between. He however, mentioned that he has no personal knowledge as he was not the concerned engineer at that relevant time, but he has ascertained the facts from the records. He has specifically pointed to the record of Partap Singh, which is Ex. R-1 that it shows that though he was on sanctioned strength of beldars, but he did not turn up for duty. He however, maintained that there is no specific note on the muster roll that Partap Singh left on his own. He also mentioned that no such record of other beldars has been brought by him. The chart shows that petitioners Nos. 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, & 25 have not completed 240 days in the calendar year. Petitioners 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, & 24 have completed 240 days in the calendar year. The statement of RW and also the record which has been produced does not show that the petitioners abandoned the job themselves. Admittedly, neither any notice nor any retrenchment compensation has been paid to the petitioner,

who, have completed 240 days. Therefore their retrenchment cannot be held to be in accordance with the Industrial Disputes Act & is contrary to law so, they are entitled to re-instatement. As regards petitioners No. 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, & 25, they have not completed 240 days as per the record produced by the respondent and there is no rebuttal on behalf of the petitioner by way of any documentary or reliable oral evidence. Therefore, they are not entitled to the benefit of re-instatement as they are not covered under the Industrial Disputes Act. However, petitioners have come to the Court after a considerable delay and have not mentioned that they were not gainfully employed after their retrenchment. Therefore, they are not entitled to the benefit of back wages though they are entitled to re-instatement with back seniority as per law. Issue is decided accordingly.

RELIEF

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that Petitioners No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 24 have completed 240 days of service in an calendar year and are entitled to re-instatement. However, petitioners No. 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, & 25, have not completed 240 days as per the record, therefore, they are not entitled to the benefit of re-instatement as they are not covered under the Industrial Disputes Act. But since, petitioners have come to the Court after a considerable delay and have not mentioned that they were not gainfully employed after their retrenchment, therefore, they are not entitled to the benefit of back wages though they are entitled to re-instatement with back seniority as per law. The reference is answered accordingly in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the H. P. Rajpatra.

Announced in the open court today this 16th day of August, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal—C-2—
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla.

Ref. No. 16 of 1997

Instituted on 14-2-97

Decided on 16-8-2001

1. Shri Roshan Lal son of Jharu Ram, r/o Village Melion Khatola, P. O. Sainwala, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
2. Sh. Ram Chander son of Inder Singh, r/o Village Khunto, P.O. Burmapapri, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
3. Shri Jiya Ram son of Biahna Singh, r/o Village Badon, P. O. Panjahal, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
4. Shri Chamel Singh son of Kalyan Singh, r/o Village Rukhni, P.O. Shambhuwala, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H. P.
5. Shri Joginder Singh son of Rulda Ram, r/o Village and P. O. Burmapapri, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
6. Shri Sarwan Singh son of Munshi Ram, r/o Village Palion, P. O. Burmapapri, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
7. Shri Shamsher Singh son of Baru Ram, r/o Village Kandawala, P. O. Burmapapri, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.

8. Mam Chand son of Total Ram, r/o Village and P. O. Khairwala, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
9. Aju Kumar son of Budh Ram, r/o Village Oliwal (Kotri), P. O. & Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
10. Inder Singh son of Mohan Singh, r/o Village Jarja, P. O. & Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
11. Faquir Mohammed son of Mohd. Ali, r/o VPO Bikram Bagh, Tehsil Nahan.
12. Balbir Singh son of Bahadur Singh, r/o Village Dhangwala, P. O. Bikrambagh, Tehsil Nahan.
13. Hussan Singh son of Sadhu Ram, r/o Village Khatola, P.O. Sainwala, Tehsil Nahan.
14. Roop Singh son of Shri Mantu Ram, r/o Village Snel, P. O. Gagal, Shikore, Tehsil Pachhad, District Sirmaur.
15. Shri Sohan Singh son of Shri Khem Singh, r/o Village Talon, P. O. & Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
16. Man Singh son of Shri Lachmi Singh, r/o Village Anji, P. O. Bagthan, District Sirmaur.
17. Bharat Ram son of Shri Bhangi Ram, r/o Village Dhuan, P. O. Parara, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
18. Sadanand son of Shri Dalaru Ram, r/o Village Chanar, P. O. Chalana, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
19. Khema Nand son of Shri Gobind Ram, r/o Village Chanar, P. O. Chalana, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
20. Nandar Singh son of Shri Prem Singh, r/o Village Gagal, P.O. Parara, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur.
21. Ravi Dutt son of Shri Ram Kishan, r/o Village Daru, P. O. Parara, Tehsil Nahan, Sirmaur.
22. Ram Swarup son of Shri Balaru Ram, r/o Village Chanar P. O. Chalana, Tehsil Nahan, Sirmaur.
23. Bishwa Dev son of Shri Sunder Singh, r/o Village Banlog, P. O. Chalan, Tehsil Nahan, Sirmaur.
24. Raghva Nand son of Shri Balaru Ram, r/o Village Mathang, P. O. Chalana, Tehsil Nahan, Sirmaur.
25. Roshan Lal son of Shri Inder Singh, r/o Village Lana, Chabeul, P. O. Dingar Kumar, Tehsil Pachhad, District Sirmaur.
26. Satya Pal son Shri Ram Swaroop, r/o Village Lana Baka, P. O. Bagthan, Tehsil Pachhad, District Sirmaur, H. P. ... Petitioner.

Versus

Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division Nahan, District Sirmaur, H. P. ... Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner: S/Shri A. K. Gupta & R. K. Khidta, Advocates.

For respondent: Shri B. S. Barowal, AR.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government :—

"Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Roshan Lal and 25 other workers (as per list

enclosed) by the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Nahan, Division Nahan, District Sirmaur (HP) without any notice, charge-sheet, enquiry and without compliance of Section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on completion of 240 days continuous service, is legal and justified, if not, to what relief of past service benefits including back wages, seniority and amount of compensation, the aggrieved workmen are entitled to?"

2. Claim petitions have been filed by Shri Roshan Lal and 12 others jointly and reply to their claim petition has been filed separately by the state. Shri Satya Pal has filed a separate claim petition which has also been replied to separately. Shri Sohan Singh and 11 others have filed a separate petition and reply to their petition has also been filed separately. The claim of the petitioners however, is similar that they were engaged on daily wages by the respondents and their services were terminated without complying with the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. Further that persons junior to them have been retained and therefore, is violative of section 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act, as well as they have prayed that they be re-instated in service.

3. The reply to the claim is that the petitioners were not regular in their work and only few of them have completed 240 days of employment in any calendar year. Further that they were not terminated and have abandoned the job themselves. It is also submitted that work depends upon the availability of the funds and therefore is of seasonal nature. Hence, the directions cannot be issued for regularisation or re-instatement of service.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 1-7-97 :—

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner is violative of Section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged? **OPP.**
2. Whether the petitioners No. 1 to 4, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 abandoned the employment voluntarily as alleged? **OPR.**
3. Relief.

FINDINGS

4. *Issue No. 1 & 2.* I will deal with issue No. 1 & 2 together. Some of the petitioners have appeared in the witness box namely S/Shri Roshan Lal, Hussain Singh & Sat Pal and in rebuttal Shri B. S. Barowal, Assistant Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Nahan has stepped in the witness box. Other petitioners have filed affidavits in the Court. The petitioners are depending upon the mandays chart relied upon by the respondent. All the three petitioners Roshan Lal, Hussain Singh and Sat Pal have not been effectively cross-examined. Infact no cross-examination has been done on Roshan Lal and Sat Pal and only one question has been put to Hussain Singh that he was the junior most and so was retrenched. Shri Roshan Lal has mentioned that he had completed 240 days and his services were terminated without complying with the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. Similar are the statements of Shri Hussain Singh and Sat Pal. In documentary evidence notice of the union regarding the termination a certificate of efficient working in favour of Shri Sat Pal Mark-A and regularisation of service of Shri Sat Pal is Ex. PW-3/B have been relied upon.

5. Shri B. S. Barowal has filed an affidavit in the Court which is exhibited as RW-1/A and had subjected himself for the cross-examination by the petitioners. At the very outset, it has been contended by Mr. Barowal that though notice were given to certain workmen for retrenchment, but the compensation was paid at the later stage due to some administrative problem. He however, mentioned that the record was maintained

in the office and some of the petitioners left the job themselves as the muster roll shows the vacancy, but the petitioners have been shown about during this period. He also mentioned that all these persons have completed 240 days, though they have worked only intermittently and causally. In the cross-examination by petitioner No. 16, he admitted that he worked for 337 days in 1987. Besides this oral evidence, affidavits of all the remaining petitioners have been filed, in which they have asserted that they have completed 240 days and were terminated by the department without complying with the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act.

6. The evidence which has come on record shows that the petitioners have completed 240 days which further has been admitted by the respondent in his cross-examination. However, the respondent has taken three pleas. Firstly that some of the petitioners though were given notice of retrenchment but retrenchment compensation was paid to them at a later date due to administrative problems. The law mandates that at the time of termination of service, notice, notice pay in the alternative and the commensation of retrenchment has to be tendered to the employees whose services are to be terminated. Any excuse of administrative problem will not hold good and the termination will be rendered illegal. Moreover, the administrative problem have not been spelt out nor any sporting has been produced in the Court. Therefore, this plea of the respondent cannot be accepted.

7. Second defence is that petitioners abandoned the jobs themselves. It is mentioned that muster rolls had been issued for this entire month, but the petitioners did not report and were marked absent. RW however admits that he has no personal knowledge and he is deposing only from the record and also that there is no special note or record regarding the abandonment except muster rolls for the relevant period, in petitioners are shown to be absent. However, if an employee who has completed more than 240 days in service remains absent, the employer is expected to issue a notice to him regarding his absence and to explain his misconduct for not reporting for duty or for remaining on unauthorised leave. No such notices have been given, which negates the claim of the respondent that some of the petitioners left the job on their own. Otherwise also, this is a vague plea. It has not been mentioned that who are those workmen who left the job on their own and who absented despite there being vacancy as per the muster rolls.

8. The third argument of the respondent is that the work was seasonal as the continuation of the work depends on the availability of the funds. Again the law in this regard seems to have been misread by the respondent. The supporting record in case of individual petitioners that the work which they were carrying had ceased to exist due to paucity of funds has also not been proved to show that there was a valid reason for dispensing with the services of the petitioners. However, even if the services were to be discontinued for want of funds, it was required of the respondent to retrench them only as per the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. So, this plea of the respondent is also without merit. I, therefore, hold that petitioners except petitioners Chamel Singh, Faquir Mohammed and Bharat Ram have completed 240 days of service in a calendar year and have been terminated without compliance of Section 25-F of the Act and decide the issue accordingly in favour of the petitioners except petitioners Chamel Singh, Faquir Mohammed and Bharat Ram.

RELIEF

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that termination of the petitioners except petitioners, Chamel Singh, Faquir Mohammed and Bharat Ram is illegal and they are entitled to be re-instated in service with continuity of service as per law. However, none of the petitioners have stated in their oral testimony or in the affidavits filed by them that they are without employment and were not gainfully employed during this period. Nothing has been stated that

they should be given the back wages for this period. The petitioners have come to the Court after a considerable delay and there is no written correspondence showing that they ever approached the respondent about the retrenchment. Keeping in view all these factors, I hold that petitioners are not entitled to the back wages though in view of the findings given above, they are entitled to re-instatement and seniority in accordance with law, but without back wages. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government for its publication.

Announced in the open Court today this 16th day of August, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour,
Court Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor Presiding Judge
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla.

Ref. No. 83 of 1997.

Instituted on 2-5-97.

Decided on 16-8-2001.

1. Baryam Singh son of Shri Gurprit Singh, r/o village Rampur Majri, P. O. Dhaulakuan, Tehsil Paonta-Sahib, Distt. Sirmaur.
2. Shri Sehaj Ram son of Shri Day Ram, r/o village Saltayoni P. O. Birla, Tehsil Paonta, District Sirmaur, H. P.
3. Shri Jaswant Singh son of Shri Mohan Singh r/o village Purli, P. O. Bharog-Banari, Tehsil Paonta, District Sirmaur, H. P.
4. Shri Ram Pal son of Shri Anant Ram r/o village Rampur Majri P. O. Dhaulakuan, Tehsil Paonta, District Sirmaur.
5. Shri Ashok Kumar son of Late Shri Kishan Lal r/o village Majra, Tehsil Paonta, District Sirmaur.
6. Shri Rajinder Singh son of Shri Banwari Lal, r/o village & P. O. Kolar, Tehsil Paonta, District Sirmaur.
7. Shri Dhani Ram son of Shri Mela Ram r/o village Shambalka, P.O. Haripur, Tehsil Nahan, Sirmaur.
... Petitioner.

Versus

The Resident Engineer, Giri Power House, Giri nagar, Tehsil Paonta-Sahib, District Sirmaur. H. P.

... Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioners : Shri A. K. Gupta, AR.

For respondent: Shri S. P. Sharma, AR.

AWARD

Following reference has been received from the appropriate Government :-

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Baryam Singh and 6 other workers (list enclosed) by the Resident Engineer, Giri Power House, Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Girinagar, Tehsil Paonta, District Sirmaur (HP) without any notice, charge-sheet, enquiry and without compliance of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on completion of more than 240 days service is legal and justified, if not, to what relief of service benefits including back wages, seniority and amount of compensation, the aggrieved workmen are entitled?"

2. Petitioners have filed the claim petition alleging that they were working with the respondent and their services were terminated with out following the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is also contended that even those persons who have not completed 240 days were entitled to notice of 10 days as per Certified Standing Orders. Hence, they are entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and seniority.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent it is submitted that the claim is ancient and therefore, suffers from delay and laches and there is no cause of action in favour of the petitioners.

4. On merits it is contended that petitioners were working very casually and did not complete 240 days in any one calendar year. Further that they were not terminated by the respondent. Rather they left the job on their own will. It is also mentioned that Baryam Singh is working with M/s Asia Steel and Allied Ltd., Rampur Mazri, Dhaula Kuan, Tehsil Paonta since 9-4-87 and is gain fully employed. Hence, that the petitioners are not entitled to the benefits claimed.

5. On the pleadings of the parties my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 18-6-98;—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner by the respondent is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, its effect ?
OPP.
2. Whether the petition is barred by delay and laches ?
If so its effect ?
OPR.
3. Relief.

FINDINGS

6. *Issue No.1. & 2.*—I will deal with both these issues together. One of the petitioners Shri Dhani Ram has been examined in the Court and he has deposed for himself as well for other petitioners. It has also been stated by Ld. Counsel for the petitioner that for the purpose of their joining duties and retrenchment he relies upon the written statement filed by the respondent. Meaning thereby that for actual working days the petitioners rely on the record of the respondent. Shri Dhani Ram has mentioned that he joined in 1972 and was terminated in the year 1982 and other petitioner were employed on different dates. However, some of the new appointments were made and those persons are still continuing such as Duli Khan, Molu Ram and Prem Chand. He also mentions that he represented to the Deputy Commissioner and to the Hon'ble Chief Minister and he was given verbal assurances that he will be kept. But to no avail. In the cross-examination it was suggested that he was casual in his work and left the job on his own which suggestion is denied by him. He also denied knowledge that Baryam Singh is working with Asia Steel and Alloys, Dhaula Kuan and Jaswant Singh and Sehaj Ram are also working somewhere.

7. Shri G. S. Saini, Assistant Executive Engineer of the respondent has appeared on behalf of the respondent. He has mentioned that petitioners were in their employment as per the details given in the reply but they left the job on their own. He however, admitted in the cross-examination that he has no personal knowledge as he joined the Sub-Division only in 1999 and he has not come across any record showing the abandonment. However, he maintained that there were no standing order prior to 1985. So no notice was required to be served as per the standing orders. He also admitted that new recruitments were made.

8. The working days detail given by the respondent in reply is admitted to be correct by the petitioners as per the statement of their counsel. As per this detail petitioner No. 3 Shri Jaswant Singh is shown to have joined the department on 26-7-86 and left on 25-9-86. Meaning thereby that he has worked for two months only. Whereas petitioners Baryam Singh, Sehaj Ram,

Ram Pal, Ashok Kumar, Rajinder Singh and Dhani Ram are shown to have worked for a longer period of more than 240 days. Therefore, except petitioner Jaswant Singh, all other petitioners have completed more than 240 days as per the admission of the respondent in the reply. The only question which requires consideration is whether the petitioners left the job on their own or whether they have been terminated. The cross-examination of the respondents shows that he has no personal knowledge regarding the abandonment of job nor any such record is available in the office. Therefore, the plea of the respondent can not be accepted that the job was left by the petitioners themselves. The next question which has been raised is that petitioners have come to the Court after considerable delay. I agree with this proposition raised by the respondent as some of the petitioners such as Ram Pal was terminated in 1978 but he approached the Court only in 1997. However, it is settled proposition of Law that limitation Act is applicable to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Therefore, though the legal remedy is not barred to the petitioners but petitioners have to suffer for their laches and delay to the extent that they can not claim any monetary benefits or arrears for this period when they slept over their rights. In these circumstances I hold that the termination of the services of the petitioners No. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 except petitioner No. 3 Shri Jaswant Singh is not in accordance with the section 25-F of the act. Therefore, petitioner No. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and except petitioner No. 3 are entitled to reinstatement with seniority as per Law but they are not entitled to any back wages on account of their laches and delay. Issues are decided accordingly.

RELIEF

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that petitioner No. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, & 7 except petitioner No. 3 are entitled to re-instatement with seniority as per law. But they are not entitled to any back wages on account of their delay and laches. Reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent for publication in accordance with Law.

Announced in the open Court this 16th day of August, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour
Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor Presiding Judge
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 257/98.

Instituted on 10-12-98.

Decided on 17-8-2001.

vs Prakash Chand s/o Sh. Gulaba Ram, Village and P. O. Ghangnu, Tehsil Sundernagar, District Mandi, H. P.

Versus

M/s Hotel Chandan, the Mall Shimla, through its Manager/Proprietor.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

ORDER

Shri Hem Raj, AR for petitioner.

Shri Vipul Prabhakar, Advocate for respondent.

Both the parties have agreed to settle the dispute outside the Court and have filed settlement EX. PA in this

regard. Petitioner has made a statement on oath in the Court today that he has received a sum of Rs. 30,000/- in full and final settlement of this claim. He has also foregone his right to the claim of reinstatement.

In view of the settlement EX. PA and statement on oath the reference is answered accordingly as the Petitioner has received his full and final settlement of his claim. He is not entitled to reinstatement. A copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in accordance with Law.

Announced in the open Court this 17th day of August, 2001.

Seal. **ARUNA KAPOOR,**
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour
Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court Shimla

Ref. No. 17 of 1998

Instituted on 18-2-98

Decided on 18-8-2001

Shri Gurdev Singh son of Shri Thakur Dass, village Dhalhta, P. O. Lahri, Tehsil Naina Devi Ji, District Bilaspur, H. P. *Petitioner.*

Versus

Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub-Division, Ganguwal, District Bilaspur, H. P. *Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner: Shri Sunder Singh, AR.

For respondent: Shri S. P. Sharma, AR.

AWARD

Following reference has been received from the appropriate Government:—

“Whether the termination of the services of Shri Gurdev Singh son of Shri Thakur Dass by the Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub-Division, Ganguwal, P.O. Ganguwal, Sub-Tehsil Naina Devi Ji, District Bilaspur, H. P. on 22-6-1995 is legal and justified? If not, to what amount of back wages, past service benefits and relief, the above worker is entitled to from the above employer?”

2. In the claim petition, petitioner has alleged that he worked with the respondent from 1981 till 1995 with breaks in between when he was not entrusted any work. It is also submitted that he was assigned number 256 in the seniority list prepared by the respondent. However, now his services have been terminated, whereas new hands are being recruited and he is not being called for reemployment. Hence, he may be reinstated in job with full seniority and back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, preliminary objections have been taken that there is no enforceable cause of action and the claim is belated.

4. On merits, it is submitted that petitioner did work with the respondent during 1981-82. Then he was again engaged in 1987-88 and that in seniority list he has been assigned Sr. No. 256. However as the work finished, so 64 daily wages workers were retrenched and petitioner being the junior most, was also retrenched after giving him notice and compensation. It is further contended that thereafter, petitioner was engaged for specific work in view of his seniority and he was disengaged when the work finished further that he did not

work for 240 days continuously from 94 to 98. Hence, there is no violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and his claim is not maintainable.

On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 21-9-1999:—

FINDINGS

5. *Issue No. 1.*—Petitioner has tendered his affidavit giving details of his employment and actual working days. In his affidavit he has mentioned that he worked from 1-1-1995 to 25-9-1995 and thereafter in 1997, 50 new persons were engaged regularly, but he was not called for reengagement. He has also mentioned that he has completed 240 days in a calendar year preceding his termination. He also stated that no notice was served on him as is required under section 25-F of the Act, nor any compensation was paid. He was cross-examined on the basis of his affidavit. He denied that he was retrenched in 1988 alongwith 64 workers and was given notice and compensation. He also denied that he was reemployed for some work on 26-10-1994 and he did not complete 240 days in any year.

6. In rebuttal Shri A. K. Dhiman Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub-Division, H. P. S. E. B. Ganguwal has appeared and stated that petitioner was retrenched in 1988 after giving him retrenchment, compensation, then he was again called for specific work from 24-12-1992 to 25-7-1993 as per document Ex. R-2, but he did not complete 240 days. His cross examination reveals that petitioner does not work from 1-1-1995 to 25-9-1995 at Ganguwal nor was terminated from there. He has also mentioned that he has taken into consideration the entire record including that of Naina Devi Section. He has expressed his ignorance that 50 new persons were engaged in 1997 and he has been given suggestion that he is deposing wrongly with regard to the working days and engagement of 50 new hands.

Ex-R-2 which has been placed on record by respondent shows that petitioner kept on working from 1993 to 1998 on different dates. It is the case of the respondent themselves that petitioner was being called as and when the work was available. Meaning thereby that it is not the case of the respondent that he abandoned these job himself or absented himself from work. Therefore, whatever breaks were given to the petitioner can be termed as fictional break and or to taken into account for the purpose of continuous employment, unless, until it is proved that he has been engaged from specific work and that specific work had come an end resulting in the termination or disengagement of the petitioner. Except verbal assertion, no record has been produced that after his alleged retrenchment in 1988, which is also not proved to be in accordance with law, petitioner was only employed for a specific work and for a specific period. Moreover, Ex. R-2 shown that from 26-12-1992 to 25-7-1993, petitioner has worked regularly and then again, he was employed from 26-10-1994 to 26-6-1995. Then again from 26-5-1997 to 25-7-1997 and lastly from 2-1-1998 to 25-2-1998. There is also a note given that he is likely to be engaged on 1-6-1998 to 25-6-1998. This Chart shows that petitioner is being called off and on at the wishes of the respondent without mentioning or proving that the work for which he is being called is for a specific period making it compulsory for the employer to disengage him. Moreover, it is not proved that petitioner was retrenched in 1988 after complying with the provisions of section 25-F of the act, neither the notice nor the retrenchment compensation is shown to have been given to him. Moreover it is also not specifically decided by the respondent that no new recruitment were made in 1997. I therefore, hold that the Petitioner by Virtue of his being in the employment continuously for 240 days could not have been disengaged without complying with the provisions of section 25-F of the act and so his termination is bad in law. I, therefore, hold that the petitioner will be construed to be in regular employment and is entitled to be reinstated in job w. e. f. 21-4-98, when he was disengaged

as per F. R-2. He is also entitled to seniority and regularisation was per law. However, since petitioner has not mentioned that he was not gainfully employed during this period, I hold that petitioner is not entitled to any wage for this period. Issue is decided accordingly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

7. *Issue No. 2*— There is no evidence or proof regarding the misconduct if any of the petitioner. Hence, this issue is decided against the respondent.

RELIEF

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that the petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in job w.e.f. 26-4-1998 when he was disengaged and is also entitled to seniority and regularisation as per law. However, since petitioner has not mentioned that he was not gainfully employed during this period, I hold that he is not entitled to any back wages for this period. The reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to appropriate government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today this 18th Day of August, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR

Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal -cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

ग्रामीण विकास विभाग

प्रधिसूचना

गिमला-9, 12 नवम्बर, 2001

मध्या मारु डीओ-1-बी0(19)-2/92-828.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश ग्रामीण विकास विभाग में कार्यरत निम्नलिखित खण्ड विकास अधिकारियों/विकास अधिकारी (महिला कार्यक्रम) राजपत्रित श्रेणी-I तथा II को उनकी सरकारी सेवा में अधिवर्षिता पूर्ण करने पर उनके नाम के सामने दर्शाई गई तिथियों से सेवा निवृत्ति करने के सहर्ष आदेश देने हैं:—

क्रम सं०	सेवा निवृत्त होने वाले अधिकारी का नाम/तिनाती म्थान	जन्म तिथि	सेवानिवृत्ति तिथि
1	2	3	4

सर्वश्री/श्रीमती:

1. इन्द्रा देवी, विकास अधिकारी (महिला कार्यक्रम) 20-2-1944 28-2-2002
2. सानिग राम, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, विकास खण्ड विस्तही। 16-2-1944 28-2-2002
3. एच0 एस0 मन्नी, परियोजना अधिकारी, जिला ग्रामीण विकास, कुल्लू। 23-3-1944 31-3-2002
4. नीलम बेदी, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, विकास खण्ड चम्बा। 15-3-1944 31-2-2002
5. रोगन लाल, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, विकास खण्ड राजगढ़। 7-3-1944 31-3-2002

1	2	3	4
6. सरन दास, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, विकास खण्ड, बंगाल।	27-3-1944	31-3-2002	
7. गोपी नन्द नास्टा, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, विकास खण्ड निरमण्ड।	15-3-1944	31-3-2002	
8. बृज भूषण गायल, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, विकास खण्ड सुन्दरनगर।	19-3-1944	31-3-2002	
9. बनवारी लाल, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, शिलाई।	22-4-1944	30-4-2002	
10. परशोतम लाल, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, सुजानपुर टिहरा।	12-6-1944	30-6-2002	
11. ठाकर सिंह चौहान, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी पच्छाड।	15-7-1944	31-7-2002	
12. मंगत राम चौहान, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, करसोग।	22-10-1944	31-10-2002	
13. लक्ष्मी कान्त जोशी, खण्ड विकास अधिकारी, टियोग।	22-11-1944	30-11-2002	

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
प्रायुक्त एवं सचिव।

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 14th May, 2001

No. EDN (S&T) A (6) 1/94.—In partial modification of this department Notification of even number dated 31-10-1998, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order that the Member Secretary, State Council for Science, Technology and Environment shall function as Member-Secretary of the Executive Committee of the above Council in place of Special Secretary (Science and Technology) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order that Special Secretary/Additional/Joint/Deputy/Under Secretary (S & T) to the H. P. Government shall henceforth be the Member of the above Executive Committee of the Council.

Shimla-2, the 14th May, 2001

No. EDN (S&T) A (1)-2/99.—In supersession of IPH department notification No. IPH (10) 42/87, dated 16-12-1987, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and (2) of Section 31 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 is pleased to appoint the Secretary (Science and Technology), to the Government of H. P. as "Appellate Authority" with immediate effect.

Shimla-2, the 25th June, 2001

No. EDN (S&T) A (4) 2296-II.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to notify the Environment Policy Guidelines for the State of Himachal Pradesh as per annexure.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to direct all the Government Departments to initiate implementation action accordingly.

Shimla-2, the 25th July, 2001

No. EDN (S & T) A (3) 2/2001.—In partial modification of this department Notification of even No. dated 08-07-1999, Governor, the Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to add the following Member and Special Invitees in the State level Bio-Technology Co-ordination Committee, with immediate effect, in the public interest :

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. Secretary (Biotechnology) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh. | Member |
| 2. Director (Health) H. P., Shimla-9. | Special invitee |
| 3. Director (Agriculture), H. P., Shimla-5. | -do- |
| 4. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, H. P., Shimla-9. | -do- |
| 5. Member Secretary, H. P. State Council for Science, Technology and Environment, Shimla-9. | -do- |
| 6. Member Secretary, H. P. State Environmental Protection and Pollution Control Board, Shimla-9. | -do- |

Shimla2, the 29th October, 2001

No. EDN (S&T) A (4) 22/96-II.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare the Department of Science, Technology and Environment as the "Nodal Agency" for coordination with the Government of India to launch a scheme during the Tenth Five Year Plan for bringing out State of Environment Reports (SoERs) on triennial basis.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to nominate the Himachal Pradesh State Council for Science, Technology and Environment Shimla as the State Host Agency for preparing State of Environment Reports (SoERs).

By order,

DEV SWARUP,
Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

By order,

Sd/-
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

भाग-2—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

To

DECLARATION UNDER SECTION 24 OF THE ACT

Nahan, the 23rd November, 2001

No. Ind/MM/4896-927.—Whereas a notice was served on Shri Ram Kumar Walia son of Shri Karam Chand Walia on 03-03-2001 under section 23-27 of the H. P. State aid to Industries Act, 1971 calling upon the said Shri Ram Kumar Walia to pay me the sum of Rs. 3350.00 plus interest due on or before 15-03-2001 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I, hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 3350.00 plus interest is due from the said Shri Ram Kumar Walia and that the property described in the attached scheduled is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

Sureties :

1. Shri Madan Lal Sharma s/o Shri Lakhu Ram, House No. 824/4, Nahan (H. P.).
2. Shri Anil Bhatnagar s/o Shri R. R. Batnagar, Upper Street, Nahan (H. P.).

Shri Ram Kumar Walia s/o Shri Karam Chand,
Prop. of M/s. Walia Sewing Machine,
House No. 2389/9, Upper Bazar,
Nahan (H. P.).

Sd/-
General Manager,
District Industries Centre,
Nahan, Distt. Sirmour (H. P.).

TOURISM DEPARTMENT

Kullu, the 17th November, 2001

CANCELLATION ORDER OF REGISTRATION OF GUEST HOUSES

No. 3-4/92-MNL-TD-2017.—Whereas Valley View Niwas (Paying Guest House) Chachoga, was registered vide Registration No. 3-4/92-MNL-TD-570, dated 6-4-1996 under the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Tourist Trade Act, 1988;

Whereas the proprietor of the above Guest house vide his application dated 3-9-2001 has requested to

YOUTH SERVICES AND SPORTS DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 22nd May, 2001

No. YSS-U (7) 5/99.—On the recommendations of Departmental Promotion Committee and in consultation with the H. P. Public Service Commission, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order, the promotion of Shri Dharambir Singh Gulia, Mountaineering Instructor of Directorate of Mountaineering and Allied Sports, Manali to the post of Senior Mountaineering and Snow rescue Instructor Class-II (Gazetted) on regular basis in the pay scale of Rs. 7220—11660 with immediate effect.

The above officer will be on probation for a period of two year from the date of joining.

Shimla-2, the 31st October, 2001

No. YSS-F (5) 4/2000.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute the State level committee to celebrate the "International year of Mountains—2002" as under :—

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Hon'ble Minister of State for Youth Service and Sports | Chairman |
| 2. Hon'ble Parliamentary Secretary for Youth Services and Sports, H.P. | Vice-Chairperson |
| 3. F.C.-cum-Secretary (Finance) | Member |
| 4. F.C.-cum-Secretary (Forest) | Member |
| 5. Commr.-cum-Secretary (YSS) | Member |
| 6. Commr.-cum-Secretary (Tourism) | Member |
| 7. Commr.-cum-Secretary (Education) | Member |
| 8. Director, Mountaineering and Allied Sports | Member |
| 9. Director, Youth Services and Sports | Member-Secretary |

The member secretary will be responsible for coordinating activities and implementing or proposed programmes and also be the Liaison Officer to co-ordinate activities between State Government and Indian Mountaineering Foundation in this regard.

cancel its certificate of Registration since he has ceased to operate the Guest House w. e. f. 3-9-2001.

Therefore, I, Shashi Thakur H.A.S. District Tourism Development Officer, Kullu (Prescribed Authority declared vide Himachal Pradesh Government notification No.-TSM-F(6)-1/93, dated 13-11-1995) in exercise the powers vested in me under Section 13(a) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Tourist Trade Act, 1988, hereby order to remove the name of the Guest House from the register and cancel its certificate of registration with immediate effect.

Sd/-
(SHASHI THAKUR),
District Tourism Development Officer,
Kullu, Himachal Pradesh,
(Prescribed Authority).

TOURISM DEPARTMENT

ORDER

Kangra, the 22nd November, 2001

No. 3-2/86-TD-DMA-1545.—Whereas the Hotel Masand Nayar Motels (P) Ltd. Palampur is registered

in the name of Shri J.W. Masand s/o Shri W.G. Masand, r/o Neugal Park, Bundla, Palampur, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra vide registration No. 3-2/86-TD-DMA-604 dated 29-3-1996 under the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Tourist Trade Act, 1988 and rules framed thereunder;

Whereas Shri J.W. Masand, Proprietor, Hotel Masand Nayar Motels, Palampur has applied for the cancellation of its registration.

Now, therefore, I, Chaman Singh, HAS, District Tourism Development Officer, Kangra at Mcleodganj (Prescribed Authority) under the above act in exercise of the powers vested in me vide section 13(d) of the Himachal Pradesh registration of tourist trade Act, 1988 hereby remove the name of the Hotel from the register and cancel its certificate of registration with immediate effect

Sd/-
(CHAMAN SINGH) HAS,
Prescribed Authority,
District Tourism Development Officer,
Kangra at Mcleodganj.

आन-3—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, संवैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फार्निंगियल कमिश्नर तथा कमिश्नर ऑफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि

गृह विभाग

अधिसूचना

हिमाचल-171 002, 15 नवम्बर, 2001

संख्या गृह(ए)बी(2)1/98.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से, हिमाचल प्रदेश पुलिस विभाग अधीक्षक ग्रेड-1, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) के पद के लिए इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न उपाब्ध "क" के अनुसार भर्ती और प्रोन्नति नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश पुलिस विभाग अधीक्षक ग्रेड-1, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 2001 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. निरसन और व्यावर्तित्य.—(1) अधिसूचना संख्या होम(ए0)-ए(3)4/74-1, तारीख 28-4-1980 द्वारा अधिसूचित और समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित हिमाचल प्रदेश पुलिस विभाग कार्यालय अधीक्षक श्रेणी-II (राजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों का एतद्वारा निरसन किया जाता है।

(2) ऐसे निरसन के होते हुए भी उपर्युक्त उप-नियम 2 (1) के अधीन इस प्रकार निरसित संशुद्ध नियमों के अधीन की गई कोई नियुक्ति, दात या कार्यवाई इन नियमों के अधीन विधिमान्य रूप में की गई समझी जाएगी।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
विन्यायक एवं सचिव।

उपाब्ध "क"

पुलिस विभाग, हिमाचल प्रदेश में अधीक्षक ग्रेड-1, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम

1. पद का नाम अधीक्षक ग्रेड-1
2. पद की संख्या 8 (आठ)
3. वर्गीकरण वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) लिपिकीय सेवाएं
4. बतनमान रु 7220-220-8100-275-10300-340-11660.

5. चयन पद अथवा अधचयन पद अधचयन पद

6. सीधी भर्ती किये जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिए आयु सीमा।

लागू नहीं

7. सीधी भर्ती किए जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिये अपेक्षित न्यूनतम शैक्षणिक और अन्य अर्हताएं।

(क) अनिवार्य : लागू नहीं
(ख) वांछनीय अर्हताएं : लागू नहीं

8. सीधी भर्ती किए जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिये विहित माप और शैक्षणिक अर्हताएं प्रोन्नति की दशा में लागू होंगी या नहीं।

आयु : लागू नहीं
शैक्षणिक अर्हताएं : लागू नहीं

9. परिवीक्षा की अवधि यदि कोई हो।

दो वर्ष, जिसका एक वर्ष से अधिक ऐसी और अवधि के लिए विस्तार किया जा सकेगा जैसा ससम प्राधिकारी विशेष परिस्थितियों में और लिखित कारणों से आदेश दें।

10. भर्ती की पद्धति—भर्ती सीधी होगी या प्रोन्नति या प्रतिनियुक्ति या स्थानान्तरण द्वारा और विभिन्न पद्धतियों द्वारा भरी जाने वाली रिक्तियों की प्रतीकतता।

100% प्रोन्नति द्वारा

11. प्रोन्नति, प्रतिनियुक्ति या स्थानान्तरण की दशा में श्रेणियां जिनसे प्रोन्नति, प्रतिनियुक्ति या स्थानान्तरण किया जा सकेगा।

अधीक्षक ग्रेड-II में से प्रोन्नति द्वारा जिनका 3 वर्ष का नियमित सेवा-काल या ग्रेड में (31-3-1998) तक की गई लगातार तदर्थ सेवा को सम्मिलित करके 3 वर्ष का संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल हो, ऐसा न होने पर अधीक्षक ग्रेड-II में से प्रोन्नति द्वारा जिनका अधीक्षक ग्रेड-II और वरिष्ठ सहायक का संयुक्त रूप में 9 वर्ष का नियमित सेवाकाल या ग्रेड में 31-3-1998 तक की गई लगातार तदर्थ सेवा को सम्मिलित करके 9

वर्ष का संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल हो।

(1) प्रोन्नति के सभी मामलों में पद पर नियमित नियुक्ति से पूर्व सम्भरण पद में 31-3-1998 तक की गई निरन्तर तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, प्रोन्नति के लिये इन नियमों में यथाविहित सेवाकाल के लिए, इरा शर्त के अधीन रहते हुए गणना में ली जाएगी, कि सम्भरण प्रवर्ग में तदर्थ नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के प्रसार चयन की उचित स्वीकार्य प्रक्रिया को प्रप्ताने के पश्चात् की गई थी। परन्तु यह कि उन सभी मामलों में जिनमें कोई कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति सम्भरण पद में अपने कुल सेवाकाल (31-3-1998 तक तदर्थ आधार पर की गई तदर्थ सेवा सहित जो नियमित सेवा/नियुक्ति के अनुसरण में हो, को शामिल करके) के आधार पर उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट उपबन्धों के कारण विचार किए जाने का पात्र हो जाता है, वहाँ अपने-अपने प्रवर्ग/पद/कांडर में उससे वरिष्ठ सभी व्यक्ति विचार किए जाने के पात्र समझे जाएंगे और विचार करते समय कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति से ऊपर रखे जाएंगे :

परन्तु उन सभी पदधारियों की, जिन पर प्रोन्नति के लिए विचार किया जाना है, की कम से कम तीन वर्ष की न्यूनतम ग्रहता सेवा या पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों में विहित सेवा जो भी कम हो, होगी :

परन्तु यह और भी कि जहाँ कोई व्यक्ति पूर्वगामी परन्तुक की अपेक्षाओं के कारण प्रोन्नति किए जाने सम्बन्धी विचार के लिए अपात्र हो जाता है, वहाँ उससे कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति भी ऐसी प्रोन्नति के विचार के लिए अपात्र समझा जाएगा।

स्पष्टीकरण.—अन्तिम परन्तुक के अन्तर्गत कनिष्ठ पदधारी प्रोन्नति के लिए अपात्र नहीं समझा जाएगा यदि वरिष्ठ अपात्र व्यक्ति भूतपूर्व सैनिक है जिसे डिमोबिलाईज्ड आर्मेड फोर्स परसोनल (रिजर्वेशन आफ वेकेंसीज इन हिमाचल स्टेट नान-टेक्नीकल सर्विसिज) रुल्ज, 1972 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती किया गया हो तथा इनके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों या जिसे ऐक्स-सर्विस-मैन (रिजर्वेशन आफ वेकेंसीज इन दो हिमाचल प्रदेश टेक्नीकल सर्विसिज) रुल्ज, 1985 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती किया गया हो तथा इनके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों।

(2) इसी प्रकार स्थायीकरण के सभी मामलों में ऐसे पद पर नियुक्ति प्रोन्नति से पूर्व 31-3-1998 तक की गई तदर्थ सेवा यदि कोई हो, सेवाकाल के लिए गणना में ली जाएगी, यदि तदर्थ नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति उचित चयन के पश्चात् और भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के अनुसार की गई थी :

परन्तु 31-3-1998 तक की गई उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट तदर्थ सेवा को गणना में लेने के पश्चात् जो रयायीकरण होगा उसके फल-स्वरूप पारस्परिक वरीयता अपरिवर्तित रहेगी।

12. यदि विभागीय प्रोन्नति समिति विद्यमान हो, तो उनकी संरचना।

जैसी कि सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर गठित की जाए।

13. भर्ती करने में जिन परिस्थितियों में हिमाचल प्रशासक सेवा आयोग से परामर्श किया जाएगा।

जैसा कि विधि द्वारा अपेक्षित हो।

14. सीधे भर्ती किए जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिए अपेक्षा।

लागू नहीं।

15. सीधे भर्ती द्वारा पद पर नियुक्ति के लिये चयन।

लागू नहीं।

16. आरक्षण

उक्त सेवा में नियुक्ति हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर अनुसूचित जातियों/अनुसूचित जन-जातियों/अन्य पिछड़े वर्गों और अन्य प्रवर्ग के व्यक्तियों के लिये सेवाओं में आरक्षण की बाबत जारी किए गए अनुदेशों के अधीन होगी।

17. विभागीय परीक्षा

सेवा में प्रत्येक सदस्य को विभागीय परीक्षा नियम, 1997 में यथा विहित विभागीय परीक्षा पारित करनी होगी।

18. शिथिल करने की शक्ति

जहाँ राज्य सरकार की यह राय हो कि ऐसा करना आवश्यक या समीचीन हो, वहाँ वह कारणों को अभिलिखित करके और हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से, आदेश द्वारा इन नियमों के किन्हीं उपबन्धों को किसी वर्ग या व्यक्तियों के प्रवर्ग या पदों की बाबत शिथिल कर सकेगी।

[Authoritative English text of this department notification No. Home(A)B(2)1/98, dated 15-11-2001 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

HOME DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 15th November, 2001

No. Home(A)B(2)1/98.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution

of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to make the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post of Superintendent Grade-I, Class-I (Gazetted), in the Department of Police, Himachal Pradesh, as per Annexure "A" attached to this Notification, namely :—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Police Department Superintendent Grade-I, Class-I (Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2001.

(2) These Rules shall come into force from the date of publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Repeal and savings.*—(i) The Himachal Pradesh Police Department, Office Superintendent, Class-II (Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules notified vide notification No. Home (A)A(3)-4/74-I, dated 28-4-1980 and as amended from time to time are hereby repealed.

(ii) Notwithstanding such repeal, any appointment made or anything done or any action taken under relevant rules, so repealed under sub-rule 2(1) *supra* shall be deemed to have been validly made, done or taken under these rules.

By order,

Sd/-

Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

ANNEXURE "A"

RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION RULES FOR THE POST OF SUPERINTENDENT GRADE-I, CLASS-I (GAZETTED) IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, HIMACHAL PRADESH

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Name of the post | Superintendent Grade-I |
| 2. Number of posts | 8 (Eight) |
| 3. Classification | Class-I (Gazetted)
Ministerial Services |
| 4. Scale of pay | Rs. 7220-220-8100-275-
10300-340-11660. |
| 5. Whether selection post or Non-Selection post. | Non-Selection |
| 6. Age for direct recruitment. | Not applicable |
| 7. Minimum educational and other qualifications required for direct recruits. | (A) <i>Essential</i> : Not applicable
<i>Desirable Qualifications</i> :
Not applicable. |
| 8. Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits will apply in the case of the promotees. | <i>Age</i> : Not applicable
<i>Educational Qualifications</i> :
Not applicable. |
| 9. Period of probation, if any. | Two years subject to such further extension if for a period not exceeding one year as may be ordered by the competent authority in special circumstances and reasons to be recorded in writing. |

10. Method of recruitment—whether by direct recruitment or by promotion, deputation, transfer and the percentage of vacancies to be filled in by various methods.

100% by promotion

11. In case of recruitment by promotion, deputation/transfer, grade from which promotion/deputation/transfer is to be made.

By promotion from amongst the Superintendent Grade-II who possess 3 years regular service or regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* (rendered upto 31-3-1998) service, in the grade failing which by promotion from amongst the Superintendent Grade-II who possess 9 years regular service or regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* (rendered upto 31-3-1998) service, as Superintendent Grade-II & Senior Assistant combined in the grade.

(1) In all cases of promotion, the continuous *ad hoc* service rendered in the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to regular appointment to the post shall be taken into account towards the length of service as prescribed in these rules for promotion subject to the conditions that the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion in the feeder category had been made after following proper acceptable process of selection in accordance with the provisions of Recruitment & Promotion Rules, provided that in all cases where a junior person becomes eligible for consideration by virtue of his total length of service (including the service rendered on *ad hoc* basis upto 31-3-1998 followed by regular service/appointment) in the feeder post in view of the provisions referred to above, all persons senior to him in the respective category/post/cadre shall be deemed to be eligible for consideration and placed above the junior person in the field of consideration.

Provided that all incumbents to be considered for promotion shall possess the minimum qualifying service of at least three years or that prescribed in the Recruitment & Promotion Rules for the post, whichever is less.

Provided further that where a person becomes ineligible to be considered for promotion on account of the requirements of the preceding proviso, the person(s) junior to him shall also be deemed to be ineligible for consideration for such promotion.

Explanation.—The last proviso shall not render the junior incumbents ineligible for consideration for promotion if the senior ineligible persons happened to be Ex-servicemen recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Demobilised Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of Vacancies in Himachal State Non-Technical Services) Rules, 1972 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder or recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Ex-servicemen (Reservation of vacancies in the Himachal Pradesh Technical Services) Rules, 1985 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder.

(2) Similarly, in all cases of confirmation *ad hoc* service rendered on the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to the regular appointment against such post shall be taken into account towards the length of service, if the *ad hoc* appointment / promotion had been made after proper selection and in accordance with the provisions of the R & P Rules:

Provided that *inter-se* seniority as a result of confirmation after taking into account, *ad hoc* service rendered upto 31-3-1998 as referred to above shall remain unchanged.

18. Power to relax

Where the State Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to do so, it may, by order for reasons to be recorded in writing and in consultation with the H.P.P.S.C. relax any of the provisions of these Rules with respect to any class or category of persons or posts.

कार्मिक विभाग (नो-11)

अधिसूचना

जिम्मा-2, 23 नवम्बर, 2001

संख्या पर0(एपी0-बी0) बी(2)-6/99.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस विभाग की समसंख्यांक अधिसूचना तारीख 14-2-2000 द्वारा अधिसूचित, हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड में चौकीदार, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 2000 में अंगीकृत करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड, चौकीदार, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (द्वितीय संशोधन) नियम, 2001 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपाब्ध "क" का संशोधन.—हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड चौकीदार, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं पदोन्नति नियम, 2000 के उपाब्ध "क" स्तम्भ संख्या-6 में श्रृंखला और शब्दों "18 से 38 वर्ष" के स्थान पर शब्द "18 से 45 वर्ष" श्रृंखला और रखे जाएंगे।

अदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
वित्तियुक्त एवं सचिव।

2. If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists, what is its composition? As may be constituted by the Government from time to time.

3. Circumstances under which the H.P.P.S.C. is to be consulted in making recruitment. As a required under the law.

4. Essential requirement for a direct recruitment. Not Applicable

5. Selection for appointment to the post by direct recruitment. Not Applicable

5. Reservation The appointment to the service shall be subject to orders regarding reservation in the service for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Other Backward Classes/Other Categories of persons issued by the Himachal Pradesh Government from time to time.

6. Departmental Examination. Every member of the service shall pass a Departmental Examination as prescribed in the Departmental Examination Rules, 1997.

[Authoritative English text of Government notification No. Per.-(AP. B) B(2)-6/99, dated 23-11-2001 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT (Apptt.-II)

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 23rd November, 2001

No. Per. (AP-B) B(2)-6/99.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following rules to further amend the Himachal Pradesh, Subordinate Services Selection Board, Chowkidar, (Class-IV Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000, notified vide this Department notification even number dated 14-02-2000, namely:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Chowkidar, (Class-IV, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion (Second Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of its publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. Amendment of Annexure "A".—In Annexure "A" to the Himachal Pradesh, Subordinate Services Selection Board, Chowkidar, Class-IV (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000 for the words and figures "between 18 and 38 years" the words & figures "between 18 and 45 years" shall be substituted.

By order,

Sd/-
F. C. cum-Secretary.

कार्मिक विभाग
(नि०-II)

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171 002, 23 नवम्बर, 2001

संख्या पर० (एपी०-बी०) बी० (2)-6/99.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना तारीख 14-2-2000 द्वारा अधिसूचित हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड में चपड़ासी, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों 2000 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड चपड़ासी वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (द्वितीय संशोधन) नियम, 2001 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपाब्ध 'क' का संशोधन.—हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड, चपड़ासी, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 2000 के उपाब्ध "क" के स्तम्भ संख्या 6 में श्रंको और शब्दों "18 से 38 वर्ष" के स्थान पर "18 से 45 वर्ष" श्रंक शब्द रखे जायेंगे।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

[Authoritative English text of this Department Notification No. Per (AP. B) B (2)-6/99, dated 23-11-2001 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT
(Apptt. II)

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 23rd October, 2001

No. Per. (AP. B.) B. (2)-6/99.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following Rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Peon (Class-IV Non-Gazetted), Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000 notified vide this Department notification, of even number dated 14-2-2000, namely:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Peon, Class-IV (Non-Gazetted), Recruitment and Promotion (Second Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. Amendment of Annexure "A".—In Annexure "A" to the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Peon, Class-IV (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000, for the words and figures "Between 18 and 38 years" the words and figures "Between 18 and 45 years" shall be substituted.

By order,

Sd/-
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

कार्मिक विभाग
(नि०-II)

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171 002, 23 नवम्बर, 2001

संख्या पर० (एपी०-बी०) बी० (2)-6/99.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना तारीख 14-2-2000 द्वारा अधिसूचित, हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड में सफाईकर्ता, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम 2000 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड, सफाईकर्ता, वर्ग-IV, (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (द्वितीय संशोधन) नियम, 2001 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किये जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपाब्ध "क" का संशोधन.—हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड, सफाईकर्ता, वर्ग-IV (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 2000 के उपाब्ध "क" में स्तम्भ संख्या-6 में श्रंको और शब्दों "18 से 36 वर्ष" के स्थान पर "18 से 45 वर्ष" श्रंक और शब्द रखे जायेंगे।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

[Authoritative English text of Government Notification No. Per. (Ap. B) B (2)-6/99, dated 23-11-2001, as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT
(Apptt. II)

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 23rd November, 2001

No. Per. (AP. B) B (2)-6/99.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following Rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Sweeper, Class-IV (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000 notified vide this department notification of even number dated 14-2-2001, namely:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Sweeper Class-IV (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion (Second Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of publication in the Rajpatra of Himachal Pradesh.

2. Amendment of Annexure "A".—In Annexure "A" to the Himachal Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Board, Sweeper, Class-IV (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000 for the words and figures "Between 18 and 38 years" the words and figures "Between 18 and 45 years" shall be substituted.

By order,

Sd/-
Commr.-cum-Secretary.

मिचार्ड एवं जन-स्वास्थ्य विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 20 जुलाई, 2001

संख्या आई.पी.0एच.0(ए) 3-2/95.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या आई.पी.0एच.0(ए) 3-2/95 तारीख 23-10-1996 द्वारा अधिसूचित, हिमाचल प्रदेश सिचार्ड एवं जन-स्वास्थ्य विभाग में विधि सहायक वर्ग-III (अराजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1996 में संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश सिचार्ड एवं जन स्वास्थ्य विभाग, विधि सहायक वर्ग-III (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 2001 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपावध "क" का संशोधन.—हिमाचल प्रदेश सिचार्ड एवं जन-स्वास्थ्य विभाग, विधि सहायक वर्ग-III (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1996 के उपावध "अ" में:—

(क) स्तम्भ संख्या-2 के सामने विद्यमान उपबन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात्:—

3 (तीन)

(ख) स्तम्भ संख्या-4 के सामने विद्यमान उपबन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात्:—

"हो 6400-200-7000-220-8100-275-1030 0-340-10640".

(ग) स्तम्भ संख्या-6 के सामने विद्यमान उपबन्धों में अंक "35" के स्थान पर "45" अंक प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा।

(घ) स्तम्भ संख्या-11 के सामने विद्यमान उपबन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किये जायेंगे, अर्थात्:—

भारत में किसी मान्यता प्राप्त विश्वविद्यालय से विधि में व्यावसायिक उपाधि या इसके समकक्ष उपाधि रखने वाले वरिष्ठ सहायकों/सांख्यिकीय सहायकों/वरिष्ठ बतनमान आशु-लिपिकों में से, जिनका 6 वर्ष का नियमित सेवाकाल या 31-3-1998 तक की गई लगातार तदर्थ सेवा सहित 6 वर्ष का संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल हो, प्रोन्नति द्वारा, ऐसा न होने पर कनिष्ठ सहायकों में से जिनका दस वर्ष का नियमित सेवाकाल या 31-3-1998 तक की गई लगातार तदर्थ सेवा सहित 10 वर्ष का संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल हो, प्रोन्नति द्वारा, ऐसा न होने पर अन्य सरकारी विभागों में इस पद के समतुल्य बतनमान में कार्यरत विधि सहायकों में से प्रतिनियुक्ति द्वारा:

परन्तु यह कि प्रोन्नति के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्थात्, वरिष्ठ सहायकों/सांख्यिकीय सहायकों/वरिष्ठ बतनमान आशुलिपिकों की दशा में, पात्र कर्मचारियों को, उनकी कांड़ अनुसार वरिष्ठता को छोड़ बिना उनके सेवाकाल के आधार पर एक संयुक्त वरिष्ठता सूचि विहित की जाएगी।

(1) प्रोन्नति के सभी मामलों में, पद पर नियमित नियुक्ति से पूर्व सम्मरण पद में 31-3-1998 तक की गई निरन्तर तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, प्रोन्नति के लिए इन नियमों में यथा विहित सेवाकाल के लिए, इस शर्त के अधीन रहते हुए गणना में ली जाएगी, कि सम्मरण प्रवर्ग में तदर्थ नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के अनुसार चयन की उचित स्विकार्य प्रक्रिया की अपनाने के पश्चात् की गई थी। परन्तु यह कि उन सभी मामलों में जिनमें कोई कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति सम्मरण पद में अपने कुल सेवाकाल (31-3-1998 तक तदर्थ आधार पर की गई तदर्थ सेवा सहित जो नियमित सेवा/नियुक्ति के अनुसरण में हो, को शामिल करके) के आधार पर उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट उपबन्धों के कारण विचार किए जाने का पात्र हो जाता है, वहां अपने-अपने प्रवर्ग/पद/कांड़ में उससे वरिष्ठ सभी व्यक्ति विचार किए जाने के पात्र समझे जायेंगे और विचार करते समय कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति से ऊपर रख जाएंगे।

परन्तु उन सभी पदधारियों की, जिन पर प्रोन्नति के लिये विचार किया जाता है, की कम से कम तीन वर्ष की न्यूनतम ग्रहणा सेवा या पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों में विहित सेवा जो भी कम हो, होगी।

परन्तु यह और भी कि जहां कोई व्यक्ति पूर्वगामी परन्तुक की अपेक्षाओं के कारण प्रोन्नति किए जाने सम्बन्धी विचार के लिए अपात्र हो जाता है, वहां उससे कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति भी ऐसी प्रोन्नति के विचार के लिए अपात्र समझा जायेगा/समझे जायेंगे।

स्थापना.—अन्तिम परन्तुक के अन्तर्गत कनिष्ठ पदधारी प्रोन्नति के लिये अपात्र नहीं समझा जायेगा/समझे जायेंगे यदि वरिष्ठ अपात्र व्यक्ति भूतपूर्व सैनिक है जिसे डिमोबिलाइज्ड आर्मेड फोर्स परसोनल (रिजर्वेशन ग्राफ बेकैन्सीज इन हिमाचल स्टेट नान-टैक्निकल सर्विसेज) क्लज, 1972 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती किया गया हो तथा इनके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों या जिसे एक्स सर्विसमें (रिजर्वेशन ग्राफ बेकैन्सीज इन दी हिमाचल प्रदेश टैक्निकल सर्विसेज) क्लज, 1985 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती किया गया हो तथा इसके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों।

(2) इसी प्रकार स्थापना के सभी मामलों में ऐसे पद पर नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति से पूर्व 31-3-1998 तक की गई तदर्थ सेवा यदि कोई हो, की सेवाकाल के लिए गणना में ली जायेगी, यदि तदर्थ नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति उचित चयन के पश्चात् और भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के अनुसार की गई थी:

परन्तु 31-3-1998 तक की गई उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट तदर्थ सेवा को गणना में लेने के पश्चात् जो स्थापना होगा उसके फलस्वरूप पारस्परिक वरीयता अग्रवर्तित रहेगी।

अदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-

वित्तीयक एवं सचिव।

[Authoritative English text of this department notification No. IPH(A)(3)-2/95, dated 20-7-2001 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

IRRIGATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 20th July, 2001

No IPH(A)(3)-2/95.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to make the following rules to amend the Himachal Pradesh Department of Irrigation & Public Health Legal Assistant (Class-III, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1996, notified vide this Department Notification No. IPH(A)(3)-2/95, dated 23-10-1996, namely:—

1 Short title and commencement.—(i) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh, Department of

Irrigation and Public Health Legal Assistant (Class-III, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion (First Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(ii) These rules shall come into force from the date of publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2 Amendment of Annexure "A",—In Annexure "A" to the Himachal Pradesh Department of Irrigation & Public Health Legal Assistant (Class-III Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1996:—

(a) For the existing provisions against Column No. 2, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"3 (Three)"

(b) For the existing provisions against Column No. 4, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"Rs. 6100-200-7000-220-8100-275-10300-340-10640".

(c) In the existing provisions against the Col. No. 6 for the figure "35", the figure "45" shall be substituted.

(d) For the existing provisions against Col. No. 11, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"By promotion from amongst Senior Assistants/Statistical Assistants/Sr. Scale Stenographers who possess the professional degree in Law or its equivalent from a recognised University in India with 6 years regular or regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* service (rendered upto 31-3-1998) failing which by promotion amongst the Junior Assistants with 10 years regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* service (rendered upto 31-3-1998) failing which by deputation from amongst the Legal Assistants working in the identical pay scales of this post in other Government Departments:

Provided that for the purpose of promotion i. e. in case of Senior Assistants/Statistical Assistants/Sr. Scale Stenographers combined seniority list of eligible officials on the basis of the length of service without disturbing their cadre-wise *inter se* seniority shall be prescribed."

(1) In all cases of promotion, the continuous *ad hoc* service rendered in the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to regular appointment to the post shall be taken into account towards the length of service as prescribed in these rules for promotion subject to the condition that the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion in the feeder category had been made after following proper acceptable process of selection in accordance with the provisions of R & P Rules, provided that:

In all cases where a junior person becomes eligible for consideration by virtue of his total length of service (including the service rendered on *ad hoc* basis upto 31-3-1998) followed by regular service/appointment in the feeder post in view of the provisions referred to above, all persons senior to him in the respective category/post/cadre shall be deemed to be eligible for consideration and placed above the junior person in the field of consideration:

Provided that all incumbents to be considered for promotion shall possess the minimum qualifying service of atleast three years or that prescribed in the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post, whichever is less:

Provided further that where a person becomes ineligible to be considered for promotion on account of the requirements of the preceding proviso, the person(s) junior to him shall also be deemed to be ineligible for consideration for such promotion.

Explanation.—The last proviso shall not render the junior incumbents ineligible for consideration for promotion,

if the senior ineligible persons happened to be Ex-servicemen recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Demobilised Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of Vacancies in Himachal State Non-Technical Services) Rules, 1972 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder or recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Ex-servicemen (Reservation of Vacancies in the Himachal Pradesh Technical Services) Rules, 1985 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder.

(2) Similarly, in all cases of confirmation continuous *ad hoc* service rendered in the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to the regular appointment/promotion against such post shall be taken into account towards the length of service, if the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion against such posts had been made after proper selection and in accordance with the provisions of the Recruitment and Promotion Rules:

Provided that *inter se* seniority as a result of confirmation after taking into account, *ad hoc* service rendered upto 31-3-1998 shall remain unchanged.

By order

Sd/-

Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

उद्योग विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 19 अगस्त, 2001

संख्या इण्ड0-ए0(ए0) 3-12/99.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना तारीख 14-7-2000 द्वारा अधिसूचित उद्योग विभाग हिमाचल प्रदेश में भण्डार निरीक्षण अधिकारी (वर्ग-II राजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 2000 में संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश उद्योग विभाग भण्डार निरीक्षण अधिकारी (वर्ग-II राजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 2001 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किये जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपाबन्ध "अ" के स्तम्भ 6 का संशोधन.—स्तम्भ संख्या 6 के सामने विद्यमान उपाबन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात्:—

"18 से 45 वर्ष"।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 19th August, 2001

No. Ind-A A)3-12/99.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to make the following rules to amend the Himachal Pradesh, Industries Department Store Inspection Officer (Class-II Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000, notified *vide* this

Department notification of even number, dated 14-7-2000, namely :—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Industries Department Store Inspection Officer (Class-II, Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion (First Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(2) These Rules shall come into force from the date of its publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Amendment of Col 6 of Annexure "A".*—For the existing provisions against column No. 6, the following shall be substituted, namely :—

"Between 18 and 45 years".

By order,

Sd/-
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

भाग-4—स्थानीय स्थायित्व शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायतों राज विभाग

-न्याय-

भाग-5—व्यक्तिगत अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशाषी दण्डाधिकारी चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री किशन चन्द पुत्र कसौर, निवासी गांव मदन, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय—प्रार्थना-पत्र वावत दरस्ती नाम बारा।

श्री किशन चन्द पुत्र श्री कसौर, निवासी गांव मदन, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका सही नाम किशन चन्द है जो गलती से राजस्व अभिलेख में चन्द दर्ज हुआ है जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री किशन चन्द के नाम दरस्ती बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपत्तिनामा असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबलें समायत न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिशाषी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशाषी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री कर्म चन्द पुत्र डैम चन्द, निवासी गांव धुलानी, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री कर्म चन्द पुत्र डैम चन्द, निवासी गांव धुलानी, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0) उपरोक्त ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके चाचा हिलो राम 3 वर्ष से लापता है तथा उसने अपने बच्चों को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख गुवाडो में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है जिसे वह अब जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

1. रेखा कुमारी पुत्र हिलो राम, साकिन धुलानी, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

अतः सर्व साधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में असालतन या वकालतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबलें समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिशाषी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशाषी दण्डाधिकारी चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री असतू पुत्र परमा, निवासी गांव थनेई कोठी, परगना बगोड़ी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री असतू पुत्र परमा, निवासी थनेई कोठी उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी सही आयु 1959 (42 वर्ष) है जो कि ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख/मू0 राजस्व अभिलेख थनेई कोठी में गलती से 46 वर्ष दर्ज हुई है जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री असतू की आयु दरस्ती के बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को अपने उजर/एतराज असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबलें समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिशाषी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

श्री नन्द लाल पुत्र प्रेम दयाल, निवासी गांव भटमोवा, परगना बढनौता, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र अंतर्गत् 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री नन्द लाल पुत्र प्रेम दयाल, निवासी गांव भटमोवा, परगना बढनौता, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) उपरोक्त ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसने अपने निम्नलिखित बच्चों को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख अज्ञाकोठी में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है जिसे वह जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

1. कुलदीप पुत्र नन्द लाल, गांव भटमोवा, परगना बढनौता, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

अतः सर्व साधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के द्वारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में असावतन या वकालतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री सिध पुत्र श्री धनिया, निवासी गांव वन्धा, परगना लोहटिकरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र बाबत दरस्ती नाम बारा।

श्री सिध पुत्र श्री धनिया, निवासी वन्धा, परगना लोह टिकरी, तहसील चुराह, उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका सही नाम सिध है, जो गलती से राजस्व अभिलेख में खड्कू दर्ज हुआ है, जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री सिध के नाम दरस्ती बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपत्तिनामा असावतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् किसी भी प्रकार का उजर या एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री भानू प्रताप पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह, निवासी गांव तोसागढ़, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र-बाबत दरस्ती नाम बारा।

श्री भानू प्रताप पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह, निवासी तोसागढ़, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका सही नाम भानू प्रताप है, जो गलती से राजस्व अभिलेख में भीष्म कुमार दर्ज हुआ है, जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्व साधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री भानू प्रताप के नाम दरस्ती बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपत्तिनामा असावतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश कर सकता है इसके पश्चात् किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री हरदीप ठाकुर पुत्र श्री ठाकुर दयाल, निवासी चमारा, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र बाबत दरस्ती नाम बारा।

श्री हरदीप ठाकुर पुत्र श्री ठाकुर दयाल, निवासी चमारा, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका सही नाम हरदीप ठाकुर है, जो गलती से राजस्व अभिलेख में हरदीप सिंह दर्ज हुआ है, जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्व साधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री हरदीप ठाकुर के नाम दरस्ती बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपत्तिनामा असावतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा
हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा
हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री होंसी राम पुत्र श्री भागनु, निवासी भाव खडिपोटा, परगना जसौर,
तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्रीमती हरदेई पत्नी निहालू, निवासी गांव झुजाकोठी, परगना
वढनीता तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र बावत दरस्ती नाम बारा।

श्री होंसी राम पुत्र श्री भागनु, निवासी खडिपोटा, परगना जसौर,
तहसील चुराह उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि
उसका सही नाम होंसी राम है, जो गलती से राजस्व अभिलेख में
होशयारा दर्ज हुआ है, जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इश्तहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया
जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री होंसी राम के नाम दरस्ती बारा अगर किसी
भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक
26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपत्तिनामा अदालत
या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश कर
सकता है। इसके पश्चात किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज
काबले समाप्त न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती बारा
आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत
से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा
हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री तेजदीन पुत्र श्री खैरा, निवासी गांव कैहला, परगना मेई,
तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री तेजदीन पुत्र खैरा, निवासी गांव कैहला, परगना मेई, तहसील
चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस न्यायालय में
एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसने अपने निम्नलिखित बच्चों को
ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख हस्तवास में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है जिसे
अब वह जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज
करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

1. दिखदार पुत्र तेजदीन सही जन्म तिथि 26-2-1997

2. गुलजार " " 3-5-1999

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया
जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारा अगर किसी भी
व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक
26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू
में वकालतन या अदालतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है।
इसके पश्चात कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उप-
रोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से
जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्रीमती हरदेई पत्नी निहालू, निवासी झुजाकोठी उपरोक्त ने
इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र का सही नाम
तेज लाल है, जो कि शिक्षा विभाग में गलती से शिव चन्द दर्ज
हुआ है, जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करती हूं।

अतः बजरिया इश्तहार सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता
है कि उपरोक्त श्री तेज लाल के नाम दरस्ती के बारा अगर
किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर व एतराज
हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को अपने उजर/एतराज
अदालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में आकर पेश
कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व
एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम दरस्ती
बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर
अदालत से जारी किया।

मोहर।
नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला
चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती हुमदेई उर्फ मानदेई विधवा हुशयार सिंह, निवासी गांव
द्रमण, परगना कोठी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

श्रीमती हुमदेई उर्फ मानदेई विधवा हुशयार सिंह, निवासी द्रमण
उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका सही
नाम मानदेई है, जो ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में कोई कोठी में
गलती से हुमदेई दर्ज हुआ है, जिसकी दरस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करती हूं।

अतः बजरिया इश्तहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया
जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री हुमदेई उर्फ मानदेई के नाम दरस्ती के
बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर
या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को अपने उजर/
एतराज अदालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में
आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात किसी भी प्रकार का
उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम
दरस्ती बारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत
जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
नर सिंह,
अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा

श्रीमती राधो देवी पत्नी श्री श्रोम प्रकाश, साकिन अलवास, परगना
तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र बावत दरस्ती जन्म तिथि बारा।

श्रीमती राजो देवी पत्नी श्रीम प्रकाश, साकिन भलवान, परगना तीमा, तहसील चुराह ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका पुत्र नरेश पुत्र श्रीम प्रकाश, गांव भननाम, परगना तीमा, तहसील चुराह को यही जन्म तिथि 10-11-1987 है जो शिक्षा विभाग में गलत दर्ज है मही जन्म तिथि 10-11-1987 दर्ज की जानी उचित है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री टेक चन्द ने जन्म दस्तवी बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की आपति हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपतिनामा असावतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराह में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम जन्म तिथि बाग्रा प्रादेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-5-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

श्री भोखम पुत्र कावली, साकिन चलेई, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय—प्रार्थना-पत्र दस्तवी मही जन्म तिथि।

श्री भोखम पुत्र कावली, साकिन चलेई, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी मही जन्म तिथि 18-6-1945 है जो ग्राम पंचायत परिवार रिकार्ड वगलत में गलत दर्ज है। मही जन्म तिथि 18-6-1945 दर्ज की जानी उचित है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री भोखम पुत्र कावली, साकिन चलेई परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह के जन्म दस्तवी बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार की कोई आपति हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे अपना आपतिनामा असावतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराह में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम जन्म तिथि दस्तवी का प्रादेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 24-5-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

श्री निता राम पुत्र तिखना, निवासी गांव टिकरी, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री निता राम पुत्र तिखना, निवासी गांव टिकरी, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) उपरोक्त ने इस न्यायालय में

एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजार रखा है कि उसने अपने निम्नलिखित बच्चों को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख प्रान्दी में पंजीकृत न करवाया है जिसे अब जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

महिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र निता राम, गांव टिकरी, ग्राम पंचायत प्रान्दी मही जन्म तिथि 12-2-1996.

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराह में वकालतन या असावतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात कोई भी उजर काबिले समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे प्रादेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-05-01 मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

श्री नरेश पुत्र होशियारा, निवासी गांव मुईला, परगना सेई, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री नरेश पुत्र होशियारा, निवासी मुईला उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसका सही नाम नरेश है, जो गलती से भू-राजस्व अभिलेख नर सिंह में गलती से दर्ज हुआ है, जिसकी दस्तवी हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः बजरिया इशतहार सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री नरेश के नाम दस्तवी के बारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 तक अपने उजर एतराज असावतन या वकालतन इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराह में आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम दस्तवी बारा प्रादेश अदालत से जारी कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा,
(हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकासी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

श्री चतर सिंह पुत्र तोखा, निवासी गांव गगल, परगना वठनीता, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री चतर सिंह पुत्र तोखा, निवासी गांव गगल, परगना वठनीता, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस न्याया-

लय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसने अपने निम्नलिखित बच्चों को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख देह्रा में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है जिसे अब वह जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

1. रतो पुत्री चतर सिंह सही जन्म तिथि 25-1-1995

2. देवो पुत्री चतर सिंह सही जन्म तिथि 10-3-1997

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के बारे में अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में बकालतन या असालतन अपना उजर एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर एतराज काबले समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिशायी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा,
(हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशायी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)

श्री ध्याना पुत्र दयाला, निवासी गांव चिनालुई, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री ध्याना पुत्र दयाला, निवासी गांव चिनालुई, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है। उसने अपने निम्नलिखित पत्नी व बच्चों को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख आयाल में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है जिसे अब वह जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

1. वसन्ती पत्नी ध्याना, साकिन चिनालुई, परगना हिमगिरी सही जन्म तिथि 12-8-1975.

2. रीती पुत्री ध्याना, साकिन चिनालुई, सही जन्म तिथि 19-3-1995

3. प्रीतो पुत्री ध्याना, साकिन चिनालुई, सही जन्म तिथि 21-5-1997

अतः सर्व साधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के बारे में अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में बकालतन या असालतन अपना उजर एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर एतराज काबले समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-5-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिशायी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री हेम चन्द ठाकुर, अधिशायी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती वसन्ती पुत्री जान चन्द, निवासी गांव चटोगा, परगना सोहटिकरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती वसन्ती पुत्री जान चन्द, निवासी गांव चटोगा, परगना सोहटिकरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसने अपने निम्नलिखित बच्चों को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख लेमुई में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है। जिसे अब वह जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करती है।

1. हुमदेई पुत्री वसन्ती जन्म तिथि 17-10-2000.

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के बारे में अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में बकालतन या असालतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबले समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 5-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हेम चन्द ठाकुर,
अधिशायी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिशायी दण्डाधिकारी चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री तारीक हुसैन पुत्र वशीर मुहम्मद, निवासी गांव ब्योटाहन, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री तारीक हुसैन पुत्र श्री वशीर मुहम्मद, निवासी गांव ब्योटाहन, परगना हिमगिरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसने अपनी पत्नी व पुत्री को ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख पंजेई में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया है। जिसे अब वह जन्म एवं पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

1. श्रीमती हाजो पत्नी तारीक हुसैन जन्म तिथि 15-5-1980.

2. श्री हफीज मुहम्मद पुत्र तारीक हुसैन जन्म तिथि 5-8-2001.

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण के बारे में अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में बकालतन या असालतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबले समायत न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण बारे आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

प्राज दिनांक को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर असाक्षर के जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा
हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री बलदेव पुत्र दलपत, गांव पक्षर, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय :— दुस्ती प्रायः

श्री बलदेव पुत्र दलपत, निवासी पक्षर, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी सही जन्म तिथि 31-12-1950 है जो ग्राम पंचायत पक्षर अभिलेख में 61 वर्ष दर्ज है जो कि गलत है । जिसकी दुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना की है ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता कि उपरोक्त के प्रायः पंजीकरण के द्वारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम भंजराडू में बकालतन या असालतन अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है । इसके पश्चात् कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण द्वारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे ।

प्राज दिनांक.....को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ है ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्यामा पुत्र परजा, साकिन न्युफाटी, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय :— दरखास्त वगैर फरमाए जाने आदेश सचिव ग्राम पंचायत गुवाडी व पटवारी हल्का गुवाडी ।

श्री श्यामा पुत्र परजा, साकिन न्युफाटी, परगना तीसा, उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पिता का सही नाम परजा है जो ग्राम पंचायत रिकार्ड गुवाडी व पटवार मर्कल गुवाडी में परजा उर्फ हुकमी गलत दर्ज हुआ है । जिसकी दुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री श्यामा के पिता के नाम दुस्ती द्वारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर मुकद्दमा को पेश करे । इसके पश्चात् किसी भी किस्म का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा तथा उपरोक्त के नाम दुस्ती द्वारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे ।

प्राज दिनांक 5-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ है ।

मोहर ।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री लाल चन्द पुत्र हरदयाल, साकिन सांनुई, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय :— प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री लाल चन्द पुत्र हरदयाल, साकिन सांनुई, परगना तीसा उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसकी पुत्री नाम आशा की सही जन्म तिथि 25-4-1999 है जो ग्राम पंचायत रिकार्ड भंजराडू में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसे अन्तर्गत जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री लाल चन्द की पुत्री की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत रिकार्ड भंजराडू में दर्ज करने द्वारा किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर पेशी मुकद्दमा करें । इसके पश्चात् किसी भी किस्म का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त नहीं होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण द्वारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे ।

प्राज दिनांक 12-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुए ।

मोहर ।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांसी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

राम दयाल पुत्र सुबेत्त, साकिन डिडोडी, परगना कोहाल, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय :— दरखास्त वगैर फरमाए जाने आदेश सचिव ग्राम पंचायत चोली, परगना कोहाल, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा बाबत करने दर्ज जन्म तिथि 18-8-1946.

श्री राम दयाल पुत्र सुबेत्त, साकिन डिडोडी, परगना कोहाल, तहसील चुराह उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी सही जन्म तिथि 18-8-1946 है जो ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख चोली में दर्ज नहीं है । जिसे जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है ।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त श्री राम दयाल की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत चोली में दर्ज करने द्वारा कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को बकालतन या असालतन हाजिर आकर पेशी मुकद्दमा करें । इसके पश्चात् किसी भी

किस्म का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त श्री राम दयाल की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत चोली में दर्ज करने बाग्य आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आत दिनांक को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री नरैण सुख पुत्र तारा चन्द, साकिन धनेली, परगना लोह टिकरी, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—दरखास्त वर्गज करमाए जाने आदेश सचिव ग्राम पंचायत लेसवी बावत करने दर्ज परिवार रिकार्ड पत्नी अनिता व रवि कुमार पुत्र खुद।

श्री नरैण सुख पुत्र तारा चन्द साकिन धनेली उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पत्नी नामक अनिता व पुत्र नामक रवि कुमार, ग्राम पंचायत लेसवी में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसकी जन्म तिथि या क्रमशः अनिता पत्नी नरैण सिंह जन्म तिथि 5-6-1980 व रवि कुमार पुत्र नरैण सुख जन्म तिथि 15-4-2001 है। जिसे वह जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री नरैण सुख की पत्नी श्रीमती अनिता व पुत्र श्री रवि कुमार का नाम पंचायत रिकार्ड लेसवी में दर्ज करने वारा अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10-00 बजे इस अदालत में अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें। इसके पश्चात किसी भी किस्म का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त श्री नरैण सुख की पत्नी व पुत्र का नाम ग्राम पंचायत लेसवी में दर्ज करने वारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह,
जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री चेत सिंह पुत्र हरदयाल, साकिन धनेली, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती आयु।

श्री चेत सिंह पुत्र हरदयाल, निवासी धनेली, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपरोक्त ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी सही जन्म तिथि 15-8-1969 है और ग्राम पंचायत तीसा-II अभिलेख में इसकी आयु 41 वर्ष है जो गलत है। जिसकी दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त की आयु के पंजीकरण वारा अगर किसी भी

व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10-00 बजे अपना उजर व एतराज पेश कर सकता है। इसके पश्चात कोई भी उजर काबले समाप्त न होगा एवं उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण वारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री पवन कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रेम लाल, साकिन सुनेरा, परगना कोहाल, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—दरखास्त वर्गज करमाए जाने आदेश सचिव ग्राम पंचायत चोली बावत करने दस्तवी नाम विनय कुमार वजाए अभियेक कुमार पुत्र मुझ प्रार्थी।

श्री पवन कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रेम लाल, साकिन सुनेरा, परगना कोहाल, तहसील चुराह उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र का जो नाम अभियेक कुमार है जो ग्राम चोली में विनय कुमार गलत दर्ज है। जिसकी दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना करता है।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्री पवन कुमार के पुत्र का नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी किस्म का कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को इस अदालत में अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें। इसके पश्चात किसी भी किस्म का उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त नहीं होगा। अतः उपरोक्त का नाम ग्राम पंचायत चोली में दुरुस्ती करने वारा आदेश अदालत से जारी कर दिए जाएंगे, सूचित रहे।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री नर सिंह, अधिकांशी दण्डाधिकारी, चुराह, जिला चम्बा हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री सुदेश कुमार पुत्र श्री श्याम लाल, साकिन गांव डोरी, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—दरखास्त वर्गज करमाए जाने आदेश सचिव ग्राम पंचायत भंजराडू बावत करने दर्ज नाम श्रीमती सुषमा कुमारी पत्नी व तमन्ना ठाकुर पुत्री मुझ प्रार्थी।

श्री सुदेश कुमार पुत्र श्री श्याम लाल, साकिन गांव डोरी, परगना तीसा, तहसील चुराह उपरोक्त ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पत्नी नामक सुषमा कुमारी आयु 23 वर्ष व पुत्री नामक तमन्ना ठाकुर जन्म तिथि 19-10-2001 है जो ग्राम पंचायत भंजराडू में दर्ज नहीं, जिसे अब वह जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है।

यतः नवसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त के नाम पंजीकरण करने का नाम पंजीकरण का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को असातन व कालतन हाजिर आकर पेशी मुकदमा करें। इसके पश्चात् किसी भी किम्प का उजर व एतराज काबले ममायत नही होगा एवं उपरोक्त का नाम पंजीकरण करने बारा आदेश असातन न जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

नर सिंह,
अधिसायी दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०), निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश
ब मुकदमा

श्रीमती गंगा मःनी पत्नी चतर सिंह, ग्राम साकिन पानवी, तहसील निचार, जिला किन्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा अनुसार उनवान बाबा मे प्रार्थी श्रीमती गंगा मःनी पत्नी चतर सिंह ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि उसके पुत्र राम देव के पिता का नाम पंचायत अभिलेख में गलती से चन्द्र लाल दर्ज हुआ है, जो कि गलत है, तथा वास्तविक नाम चतर सिंह है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरिया राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के द्वारा किसी को भी कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को असातन व कालतन इस अदालत में प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आवें तथा अपने उजर पेश करें अन्यथा उपरोक्त आवेदक के बच्चे के पिता का नाम पंचायत अभिलेख में परिवर्तित करने के आदेश जारी किया जावेगा।

आज दिनांक 15-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत जारी हुआ है।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०),
निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०), निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश
ब मुकदमा

श्री लोक बहादुर पुत्र लाल बहादुर, ग्राम साकिन सवेकोट, जिला रांग नेपाल हाल कार्यरत हिमाचल प्रदेश विद्युत परिषद् भावानगर।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा अनुसार उनवान बाबा मे प्रार्थी श्री लोक बहादुर पुत्र लाल बहादुर ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि

उसके पुत्र लच्छी राम की जन्म तिथि 5-4-1981 है लेकिन उस को जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में पंजीकृत नहीं हुई है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरिया राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण बारा किसी को भी कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को असातन व कालतन इस अदालत में प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आवें तथा अपने उजर पेश करें अन्यथा उपरोक्त आवेदक के बच्चे का नाम पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 15-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर एवं मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०),
निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर, (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०), निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकदमा :

श्री लोक बहादुर पुत्र लाल बहादुर, ग्राम साकिन सवेकोट, जिला रांग नेपाल हाल कार्यरत हिमाचल विद्युत परिषद् भावानगर।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा अनुसार उनवान बाबा में प्रार्थी श्री लोक बहादुर पुत्र लाल बहादुर ने इस अदालत में गुजारिश की है कि उसके पुत्र शिवलाल की जन्म तिथि 8-5-1982 है लेकिन उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में पंजीकृत नहीं हुई है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरिया राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के द्वारा किसी को भी कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को असातन व कालतन इस अदालत में प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आवें तथा अपने उजर पेश करें अन्यथा उपरोक्त आवेदक के बच्चे का नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी किया जावेगा।

आज दिनांक 15-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०),
निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०), निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकदमा :

श्री लोक बहादुर पुत्र लाल बहादुर, ग्राम साकिन सवेकोट, जिला रांग नेपाल हाल कार्यरत हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद् भावानगर।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा अनुसार उतवान बाला में प्रार्थी श्री लोक बहादुर पुत्र श्री लाल बहादुर ने इस कार्यालय में गुजरात की है कि उत्तक पुत्र सुरेश कुमार की जन्म तिथि 22-2-1988 है लेकिन उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में पंजीकृत नहीं हुई है।

अतः मामलत को नजरिया राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बाग किसी को भी कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को असावतन व वकालतन इस अदालत में प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आने तथा अपने उजर पेश करे अन्यथा उपरोक्त आवेदक के वक्के का नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी किया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 15-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (नॉ०),
निचर स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्तौर (हि० प्र०)।

PROCLAMATION UNDER ORDER 5, RULE 20 C.P.C.

In the Court of Shri K. P. Singh, Sub-Judge 1st Class,
Jawali, District Kangra (H.P.)

Civil Suit No. 315/99

1. Swaran Singh, 2. Ram Singh, 3. Suresh Kumar sons of Joginder Singh s/o Dhoulu alias Dule son of Jorabar Singh s/o Lehn minor of Joginder Singh through her mother Kaushalya Devi wd/o Joginder Singh s/o Dhoulu s/o Jorabar s/o Lehn, all residents of Mohal & Mauza, Sidhpur Ghar, Tehsil Jawali, District Kangra (H. P.)

.. Plaintiffs.

Versus

General Public

.. Defendants.

Suit for Declaration

Notice to general public.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of the court that above named defendant/defendants is/are avoiding service of summons and can not be served in the ordinary way. Hence this proclamation is hereby issued against him/them to appear in this court on 17-12-2001 at 10.00 A.M. to defend the case personally or through an authorised agent or pleader failing which *ex parte* proceeding will be taken against him.

Given under my hand and the seal of this Court today the 15th October, 2001.

Seal.

K. P. SINGH,
Sub-Judge 1st Class,
Jawali, Distt. Kangra (H. P.).

PROCLAMATION UNDER ORDER 5, RULE 20 C.P.C.

In the Court of Shri K. P. Singh, Sub Judge 1st Class,
Jawali, District Kangra (H. P.)

Civil Suit No. 316/99

1. Swaran Singh, 2. Ram Singh, 3. Suresh Kumar sons of Joginder Singh s/o Dhoulu alias Dulo Minor of Joginder Singh through her mother Kaushalya Devi wd/o Joginder Singh s/o Dhoulu s/o Jorabar, all residents of Mohal & Mouza Sidhpur Ghar, Tehsil Jawali, District Kangra (H. P.)

.. Plaintiffs.

Versus

General Public

.. Defendant

Suit for declaration.

Notice to general public.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of the court that above named defendant/defendants is/are avoiding service of summons and cannot be served in the ordinary way. Hence this proclamation is hereby issued against him/them to appear in this court 17-12-2001 at 10 A.M. to defend the case personally or through an authorised agent or pleader failing which *ex parte* proceedings will be taken against him/them.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this 15th day of November, 2001.

Seal.

K.P. SINGH,
Sub-Judge 1st Class,
District Kangra (H. P.).

ब अदालत श्रीमती सुषमा वत्स, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस इन्तकाल नं०-93

तारीख पेजी-10-12-2001

श्री मलकोत सिंह, शेर सिंह पुत्र जय सिंह साकन व डाकघर
वरुणा, तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. वचित्र सिंह पुत्र ब्वाकू, 2. श्रीमती प्राज्ञा देवी, 3. श्रीमती लीला देवी पुत्रियाँ प्रताप सिंह, 3. रिखाया, 5. रोशन पुत्र व 6. श्रीमती भगवती, 7. शेनो 8. व्यासो पुत्रियाँ छगन साकन वरुणा, तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा प्रतिवादीगण।

तस्दीक इन्तकाल नं० 93 अता ए हकूक मलकोत दाबत खाता नं० 60, मिन खतीनी नं० 66, खसरा नं० 282, रकबा 0-19-40 है०, बाक्या टीका वरुणा, मोजा जुनाट, तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा का बराये जमाबन्दी वर्ष 1997-98.

उपरोक्त फरीकन को नजरिया इन्हार सूचित किया जाता है कि दिनांक 10-12-2001 को पटवार खाना वहुता में उपरोक्त इन्तकाल तस्दीक किया जाना है। फरीकन दोयम हाजिर न आ रहे हैं।

अतः फरीकन दोयम को सूचित किया जाता है कि वे उपरोक्त तारीख को सुबह 10.00 बजे हाजिर आकर अगर कोई आपत्ति/एतराज इत्यादि सम्बन्धित इन्तकाल बारा पेश करना चाहते हो तो असावतन या वकालतन पेश होकर अपना पक्ष प्रस्तुत करें अन्यथा गैर हाजरी की दशा में उपरोक्त इन्तकाल तस्दीक कर दिया जाएगा।

आज इन्हार हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सुषमा वत्स,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्रीमती सुषमा वत्स, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी फतेहपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नं० : 7/तहसील

तारीख पेजी 18-12-2001

श्री रजिन्दर सिंह पुत्र चमेन सिंह, भवाड़ा, तहसील फतेहपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

विषय.—दरहस्ती नाम व जन्म तिथि बारे।

प्राची राजेन्द्र सिंह उपरोक्त ने दरखास्त दी है कि उसके बड़े भ्रातृ की जन्म तिथि 14-6-1992 के बजाए 14-5-1992 है व पंचायत पिकाई में उसके पिता का नाम रविन्दर कुमार लिखा है जबकि पिता का नाम राजेन्द्र सिंह है। अतः इस बारा अधिनियम पंचायत में दर्ज करवाई जावे।

अतः ग्राम व खास को वज्रिया इस्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारा अगर किसी का नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने का कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह लिखित व मौखिक तौर पर असालतन या वकालत हाजिर अदालत आकर दिनांक 18-12-2001 को प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा कोई आपत्ति न होने पर भ्रुकुण्ड के जन्म व नाम पिकाई की दस्ती करने के आदेश पारित निबमानुसार बहक पंचायत पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज इस्तहार हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सुषमा वत्स,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

धर्म चन्द पुत्र लोतड़, वासी मुहाल जमला, मौजा खरपाना, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र दस्ती नाम "धर्म सिंह" के स्थान पर धर्म चन्द करने बारे।

श्री धर्म चन्द पुत्र लोतड़ ने इस अदालत में उपरोक्त सम्बन्ध में प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रेषित किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अखिलेख में धर्म सिंह दर्ज है जबकि वास्तव में उसका नाम धर्म चन्द है, इसे दस्ती किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी का कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में असालतन या वकालत हाजिर होकर पेशवा कर सकता है और अपने एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निश्चित तिथि पर कोई आपत्ति पेश न करने पर एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 17-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
खुण्डियां (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री जगदीश राम, तहसीलदार/सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मु० नं०	तारीख पेशी	उनवान मुकद्दमा
23/2001	20-12-2001	तहसील

श्री नानक पुत्र श्री खेमूद, निवासी देवगांव, मौजा हवडोल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

रोशन लाल पुत्र किहू आदि, निवासी देवगांव, मौजा हवडोल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा।

विषय.—तहसील भूमि खाता नं० 19, खतोनी नं० 33, खसरा नं० 583, कित्ता 1, तादादी 0-06-37 हैबटेयर, वाक्या मुहाल देवगांव, मौजा हवडोल, तहसील खुण्डियां।

इस्तहार बनाम : रमेश चन्द पुत्र रोशन लाल, निवासी देवगांव, मौजा हवडोल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा।

प्रतिवादी नं० 2, रमेश चन्द पुत्र रोशन लाल कहीं बाहर नोकरी करता है व प्राची उसका सही पना उपजन्म नहीं करवा सकता है इस कारण उक्त प्रतिवादी की तारीख साधारण तौर से नहीं हो रही है।

अतः इस्तहार मुस्वी मुनादी राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा उक्त व्यक्ति को सूचित किया जाता है कि वह मुकद्दमा की पेशी हेतु तारीख पेशी 20-12-2001 को असालतन व वकालतन या किसी अधिकृत एजेंट द्वारा हाजिर अदालत आवे अन्यथा उक्त तारीख को एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जगदीश राम,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री जगदीश राम, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

उनवान मुकद्दमा : इस्तकाल नं० 116 तारीख पेशी : 21-12-2001

विषय.—इस्तकाल नं० 116 हुआए हकूक मलकीयत हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-सुधार एवं मुजारा अधिनियम, 1972 की धारा 104 (3) के अन्तर्गत तस्दीक करने बारे।

1. श्रीमती कृष्णा देवी पुत्री मिलखी राम पुत्र बूटा 1/2 भाग, 2. बाल कृष्ण, 3. विषय नाथ, 4. ओम प्रकाश, 5. आनन्द भूषण पुत्र व 6. रावेश्वरी देवी, 7. सरोज देवी, 8. कृष्णा देवी, 9. सुषमा देवी पुत्रियां सोहण पुत्र बूटा भाग बराबर 1/3 भाग, निवासी जलामुखी, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) मालिकान।

बनाम

1. बाबू राम पुत्र नन्दू पुत्र खजाना 1/2 भाग, 2. रमेश चन्द, 3. जनक राज, 4. सतीश कुमार पुत्र बरडू पुत्र खजाना भाग बराबर 1/2 भाग, निवासी डाटी परयाला, मौजा हवडोल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) मुजारेयान।

श्री बाबू राम आदि वासी डाटी परयाला, मौजा हवडोल, तहसील खुण्डियां ने इस्तकाल नं० 116 अतएव हकूक मलकीयत हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-सुधार एवं मुजारा अधिनियम, 1972 की धारा 104 (3) के अन्तर्गत पटवारी हलका के पास उक्त इस्तकाल दर्ज करवा रखा है।

अतः इस इस्तहार राजपत्र द्वारा उक्त मालिकान को सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन व वकालतन एवं किसी अधिकृत एजेंट के द्वारा तारीख पेशी 21-12-2001 को तहसील कार्यालय खुण्डियां में उपस्थित होकर अपना उजर पेश करे। वसूत नर-हाजरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर उक्त इस्तकाल नं० 116 बहक मुजारेयान तस्दीक कर दिया जावेगा।

यह इस्तहार मोहर व हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जगदीश राम,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री राजीव ठाकुर, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री जगदीश चन्द पुत्र नौलू राम, वासी चड़ख, मौजा महादेव, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) प्राची।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दस्ती जगदीश सिंह के स्थान पर जगदीश चन्द के सम्बन्ध में।

श्री जगदीश सिंह पुत्र नोलू, गांव चहख, मोजा महादेव, तहसील खुशियां, जिला कांगड़ा ने इस अदालत में उपरोक्त सम्बन्ध में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व भू-अभिलेख में जगदीश चन्द पुत्र नोलू दर्ज है। जबकि वास्तव में उसका नाम जगदीश सिंह पुत्र नोलू है, उसे दस्त किया जाए।

अतः इस इस्तहार द्वारा समस्त जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम की दस्तूरी बारे किसी को किसी किस्म का एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में प्रसालतन व वकालतन हाजिर होकर वैरी कर सकता है तथा निश्चित तिथि पर कोई आपत्ति न प्रस्तुत करने पर एकतरफा फैसला कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 13-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राजीव ठाकुर,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, खुशियां,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री विचित्र सिंह ठाकुर, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

श्री होशियार राम पुत्र श्री हंसू राम, निवासी अबैरी, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण।

प्रार्थना-पत्र बाबत दस्तूरी नाम कागजात माल मुहाल व मोजा अबैरी, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में प्रार्थी होशियार ने प्रार्थना-पत्र, व्यान हल्किया तथा अन्य दस्तावेजों सहित इस न्यायालय को गुजारा है कि उसके पिता का नाम हंसू है परन्तु कागजात माल में उसके पिता का नाम रोडू है प्रार्थी चाहता है कि कागजात माल में उसका नाम होशियार पुत्र रोडू पुत्र दुलो के बजाए होशियार पुत्र हंसू पुत्र डोली दर्ज किया जावे।

अतः ग्राम जनता को इस इस्तहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर व इतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे को प्रसालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं अन्यथा किसी को हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकपक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 27-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

विचित्र सिंह ठाकुर,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, (हि० प्र०)।

PROCLAMATION UNDER ORDER 5, RULE 20 C.P.C.

In the Court of Miss Anju sood, Sub Judge, Court No. III, Mandi (H.P.)

Civil suit No. 150/99.

1. smt. Rukmani Devi w/o Sh. Kashav Ram s/o Ram Dass. 2. Prem Lal, 3. Ghanshyam minor s/o Sh. Keshav Ram through their next friend and guardian their mother Smt. Rukmani Devi. plaintiff No. 1, 4. Miss Surendri Devi d/o Shri Keshav Ram, resident of Teen Pipal, Pandoh, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi.

5. Smt. Sumna Devi alias Satya Devi d/o Keshav Ram and w/o Rup Lal, r/o Village Arki, Pandoh, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.)

Plaintiffs.

Versus

General Public

.. Defendant.

Suit for declaration under Section 34 of the Specific Relief Act read with O. 32-A. C.P.C.

To

The general public.

Whereas the plaintiff Rukmani Devi and others have filed an suit for declaration u/s 34 of the specific relief Act read with Order 32-A C.P.C. in this Court and prayed that a decree of the declaration may be passed to the effect that it be declared that Shri Keshav Ram husband of plaintiff No. 1 is not heard of for 7 years either by the plaintiffs or by whose who would naturally have heard of him, if he had been alive, and is presumed to be dead in the Eye of law and is to be shown as dead in record of the Panchayat, as also in revenue records and the plaintiff No. 1 is to be shown in the said records widow of Keshav Ram and it be declared that after recording the entires in the revenue records, the immoveable property standing in the name of Shri Keshav Ram is liable to be mutated in favour of the plaintiff being his widow, sons and daughters.

Therefore this proclamation is hereby issued to the General Public of the illaqua of the plaintiffs and their relatives to file objection if any in this Court on 17-12-2001 at 10.00 A.M. personally or through pleader as to why the decree for the declaration as prayed by the plaintiffs be not passed in favour of plaintiffs.

Given under my hand and the Seal of the Court this 31st October, 2001.

Seal.

Sd/-

Sub-Judge 1st Class,
Court No. III, Mandi (H.P.)

न्यायालय श्री एस०के० कोण्डल, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी तहसील चन्धोट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)

मिसल नम्बर : 2001

तारीख पेची : 20-12-2001.

श्री ठीकम राम पुत्र श्री नन्दू, निवासी मुहाल काऊ, इलाका यजरी, उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)

वादी

बनाम

सर्व श्री 1. खोवे राम, 2. नाग, 3. गोपाल पुत्र व 4. श्रीमती मणी विधवा शेर सिंह, निवासी वागीधाच, 5. चिड़ू राम पुत्र धनी राम, 6. टेक राम पुत्र झावे राम, 7. फतू, 8. बेली राम पुत्र डोले राम निवासीगण काऊ, 9. श्रीमती कमला पत्नी दौलत राम, निवासी बाहरी, इलाका पाटीहाड, 10. श्रीमती मीरा पत्नी डोवे राम, 11. श्रीमती मधरू, 12. द्रोपती विधवा देव राज, 13. साहवे राम, 14. तेज राम, 15. कोल राम, पुत्रगण गोहलू, निवासी काऊ, 16. सुशील कुमार पुत्र व, 17. श्रीमती लालदासी पुत्री व, 18. श्रीमती उमदी देवी विधवा चन्द्रमणी पुत्र गोहलू, निवासी काऊ, 19. किशोरी लाल, 20. चमन लाल पुत्रगण सुन्दर, 21. श्रीमती टिकम देवी विधवा व, 22. कुमारी कान्ता पुत्री सुन्दर, निवासी संवागणी, उप-तहसील सैन्ज, 23. श्रीमती पुष्पा पत्नी टेकचन्द निवासी सूर प्रीणी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू, 24. जिया लाल, 25. उत्तम चन्द पुत्रगण अंगत, निवासी पंजाई, 26. मोहर सिंह, 27. चेताराम, 28. बेली राम पुत्रगण गंगा राम, निवासी काऊ, 29. श्रीमती जई विधवा गुप्त राम, निवासी सारली, 30. श्रीमती सरनू विधवा काला, निवासी मधोली लारजी, 31. निर्मल, 32. बेमचन्द पुत्रान व 33. श्रीमती भागु विधवा जोरसिंह, निवासी लारजी 34. श्रीमती लता पत्नी इन्द्र सिंह, निवासी डहणी, इलाका यजरी, 35. बीर सिंह पुत्र

मान चन्द, 36. मेव सिंह पुत्र देव राम पुत्र भगत राम, 37. श्रीमती बिमो देवी उपमान दासी पुत्री सेव, निवासी घागणा, 38. श्रीमती कुन्ना देवी पुत्री व 39. श्रीमती मन्ना देवी विजवा मोती राम पुत्र राम, 40. श्रीमती कन्ना पत्नी जेव सिंह, निवासी घागणा, 41. श्रीमती मोना पत्नी नन्दी राम, निवासी छापीधार, 42. श्रीमती गीता, 43. श्रीमती मुमता पुत्रीया सुरज राम, 44. डाग पुत्र संगत, 45. बिनोद कुमार, 46. देवेन्द्रपान, 47. यादु नन्दन पुत्रगण मुरजमणी, 48. डाव राम, 49. बुध राम पुत्र बिमो राम, निवासी आनणा, उपमान माना चौकी प्रतिवादीगण ।

नकसीम भूमि खाना नम्बर 47/50 किला 3, रकबा ठाढ़ाडी 3-15-17 बंधा स्थित नुहान डोना/587, उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी ।

उपरोक्त दावा नकसीम में सम्पन्नित प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार मना जारी किया गये, मगर उनकी तामीव होना नहीं पाई जा रही है, इसलिए इस इशतहार राजपत्र द्वारा उक्त वजित प्रतिवादीगण को सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 20-12-2001 को अदालतन या वकालत मरुम उप-तहसील बाली चौकी में प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आकर मुकदमा नकसीम की पेंदी करे, हाजिर न आने की सूचना में एक पत्रिका कार्यवाही अमान में लाई जावेगी तथा उसके उपरान्त कोई सुनवाई नहीं होगी ।

इशतहार प्रातः दिनांक 15-10-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदानत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

एम० के० कौण्डल,
महायक नमाहती, प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील चम्पाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री मलोक सिंह ठाकुर, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

श्री मलोक राम पुत्र मुख राम, निवासी डिगली, तहसील जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथी ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा उपमानवाला में प्राथी मलोक राम पुत्र मुख राम, निवासी डिगली, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी लड़की मलकी देवी का जन्म दिनांक 30-12-1962 को हुआ परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि प्रातः पंचायत घर मुनेन के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है ।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उररीत पंजीकरण के बारे में किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22-12-2001 को अमानतन व वकालतन डग कार्यालय में सुबह 10.00 बजे हाजिर आये तथा प्रातः उजर पेश करें अन्यथा सचिव नगर पंचायत घर मुनेन को उक्त नाम जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने वाले आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे ।

प्रातः दिनांक 3-10-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदानत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

मलोक सिंह ठाकुर,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री मलोक सिंह ठाकुर, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

श्रीमती जीवनी देवी विधवा नसीर दीन, निवासी जोगिन्दर नगर, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथिनी ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा उपमानवाला में प्राथिनी श्रीमती जीवनी देवी विधवा नसीर दीन, निवासी जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पति नसीर दीन की मृत्यु दिनांक 28-10-1984 को हुई है परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसकी मृत्यु तिथि नगर पंचायत जोगिन्दर नगर के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करा सकी है ।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को नसीर दीन का नाम व मृत्यु तिथि उनकी नगर पंचायत जोगिन्दर नगर में दर्ज करने वाले कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 22-12-2001 को या इससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव नगर पंचायत जोगिन्दर नगर को उक्त नाम व मृत्यु तिथि अभिलेख में दर्ज करने वाले आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे ।

प्रातः दिनांक 3-10-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

मलोक सिंह ठाकुर,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री मलोक सिंह ठाकुर, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी
जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश
व मुकदमा :

श्रीमती रितु ठाकुर पत्नी श्री लेख राज ठाकुर, निवासी शानन, तहसील जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथिनी ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा उपमानवाला में प्राथिनी रितु ठाकुर पत्नी लेख राज, निवासी शानन, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी लड़की स्माईल ठाकुर का जन्म दिनांक 13-8-2000 को हुआ है परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि नगर पंचायत जोगिन्दर नगर के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करा सकी है ।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को स्माईल ठाकुर का नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी नगर पंचायत जोगिन्दर नगर में दर्ज करने वाले कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 22-12-2001 को या इससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव नगर पंचायत जोगिन्दर नगर को उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि अभिलेख में दर्ज करने वाले आदेश पारित दिए जायेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

मलोक सिंह ठाकुर,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री मलोक सिंह ठाकुर, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी
जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री प्रेम सिंह पुत्र मोहन लाल, निवासी सेरी, तहसील जोगिन्दर
नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश . . . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

शाम जनता

. . . प्रत्याधी।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनबान वाला में प्रार्थी श्री प्रेम सिंह पुत्र
मोहन लाल, निवासी सेरी ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा
है कि उसके लड़के रवि कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 10-12-1995 की
हुमा है परन्तु अज्ञानता वश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत
गुम्मा के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को
सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को रवि कुमार
का नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत गुम्मा के अभिलेख में
दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक
32-12-2001 को या इससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर
प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत गुम्मा को उक्त
नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश
पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

मलोक सिंह ठाकुर,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दर नगर, जिला मण्डी।

व अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता (प्रथम श्रेणी), सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नम्बर : 55/2001

नाम दावा : सेहत इन्दाज

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री पृथी पाल सिंह पुत्र करतार सिंह, निवासी मुहाल पंघ, तहसील
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश . . . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

श्री गुरदशन सिंह पुत्र इन्द्र सिंह, निवासी मुहाल पंघ, तहसील
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) . . . प्रत्याधी।

प्रार्थना पत्र : वावत सेहत इन्दाज भूमि खाता खतोनी नम्बर 21/53-
54-55 खसरा नम्बर किता 9, रकबा तादावी 591.00
वर्गमीटर बाक्या मुहाल पंघ 26/7, तहसील सुन्दरनगर,
जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

उपवर्णित मुकद्दमा में प्रत्याधी को कई बार इस न्यायालय द्वारा
समन जारी किए गए परन्तु इसकी तामील साधारण तरीके से न हो
सकी अतः अब अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि इसकी तामील
साधारण तरीके से सम्भव नहीं है। इसलिए उपरोक्त प्रत्याधीगण को
इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर आपको
उपरोक्त रकबा की दहली को बारा किसी किस्म का कोई एतराज हो
तो वह दिनांक 18-12-2001 को प्रातः 10-00 बजे अदालतन या
वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकते

ह अन्यथा आपके हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही
अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 3-11-2001 को इस अदालत की मोहर व मेरे
हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुमा।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व न्यायालय श्री गुरेन्द्र कोण्डल, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग,
बहसील चन्चोट, स्थित मोहर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा तकसीक : 2001

तारीख पेशी : 20-12-2001

अकरू, ऐवी पुत्र श्रीमती ठाकरी पुत्री व श्रीमती पुन्नी विद्या
बाग्या पुत्र दूल् व केरू पुत्र दूल् पुत्र चन्द, निवासी मुहाल वसूट,
उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी . . . वादीगण।

बनाम

सर्व श्री 1. लोहार, 2. वेद राम, 3. केशव राम पुत्र व 4.
श्रीमती पुरण पुत्री व 5. श्रीमती शेफरी विधवा हेतु, 6. आवे राम,
7. दमोदर दास, 8. तवे राम, 9. चुनी लाल, 10. डावे राम,
11. बोध राम पुत्रान व 12. श्रीमती तारा देवी पुत्री व 13.
श्रीमती परसू देवी विधवा संगत राम, 14. श्रीमती जम्बूल पुत्री व
15. चमारू राम, 16. केशव राम पुत्रान व 17. श्रीमती धूम्री
विधवा टहलू, 18. श्रीमती फागणी, 19. कुमारी शान्ता देवी, 20.
कुमारी लता देवी पुत्रीयान व 21. देवी राम, 22. जय राम, 23.
मिने राम पुत्रान श्रीमती डोलू पुत्र टहलू, 24. प्रेम, 25. उतम
पुत्रान व 26. श्रीमती दिली, 27. बाली पुत्री व 28. श्रीमती शेतू
विधवा तलसू पुत्र जन्द, 29. श्रीमती बेसी पुत्री व 30. वेद पुत्र
जिन्द, 31. लोहार पुत्र सूरत, 32. सूरत, 33. राम पुत्रान व सर्व
श्रीमती 34. शुकरी, 35. नाउरी पुत्री भाग पुत्र सिफरा, 36. परम
37. परसा, 38. छोटा पुत्रान सर्वश्रीमती 39. शाहड़ी, 40.
नाथन पुत्रीयान भवक, 41. तलू पुत्र नावण, ममस्त निवामागण
मुहाल वसूट, उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

दरखास्त तकसीम भूमि खाता नम्बर 39/66 ता 80, किता
63 रकबा तादावी 52-3-15 बोधा स्थित मुहाल वसूट, उप-
तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनबान वाला में प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन
जारी किए गए कि वह मुकद्दमा तकसीम की पैरवी हेतु हाजिर
आवे मगर कुछ प्रतिवादीगण को समन तामील साधारण तरीके से
नहीं होना पाई जा रही है।

अतः अब प्रतिवादीगण को इस इशतहार राजस्व द्वारा सूचित
किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 20-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे
उप-तहसील कार्यालय बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी में अदालतन या
वकालतन हाजिर आकर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करें, हाजिर न आने
की सूरत में एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी व बाद
में कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

इशतहार आज दिनांक 10-10-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व
मोहर अदालत से जारी हुमा।

मोहर।

गुरेन्द्र कोण्डल,

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील चन्चोट, जिला मण्डी, (हि0 प्र0)।

In the Court of Shri Kirpa Ram Sharma, Executive
Magistrate, Nerwa

Shri Vinod Kumar s/o Shri Mangat Ram, r/o Nerwa,
Pargana Chandlog, Sub-Tehsil Nerwa.

Versus

General public

Application u/s 13 (3) death and birth registration
Act, 1969.

ORDER

Shri Vinod Kumar s/o Shri Mangat Ram, r/o Village Nerwa, Pargana Chamdlog, Sub-Tehsil Nerwa, Distt. Shimla (H. P.) has applied u/s 13(3) death and birth registration Act, 1969 for seeking order to say G. P. Nerwa for making entry of the name and date of birth of his wife Smt. Shanti born on 15-3-76 and son Ritish Kumar born on 10-3-2001.

Where as the general public has been made as respondent and the undersigned is satisfy that the General Public can not be summoned ordinary and have this proclamation u/o 5, rule 20 CPC is issued and General Public is called/summond hereby in order to file the objections if any on or before the undersigned. Failing which an *ex parte* order shall be passed and case would be disposed accordingly.

Given under my hand and the seal of this court today on 15-11-2001.

Seal.

KIRPA RAM SHARMA,
Executive Magistrate,
Nerwa, District Shimla.

ब अदालत श्री किरपा राम शर्मा, नायब-तहसीलदार, उप-तहसील नेरवा (कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी), नेरवा, जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)

श्री नाल सिंह पुत्र लच्छी राम, गांव कलारा, परगना चम्दलोग, उप-तहसील नेरवा।

बनाम

श्रीम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री नाम सिंह पुत्र लच्छी राम, गांव कलारा, उप-तहसील नेरवा ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसने अपने लुकी लुकी पुत्र का नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करवाई है और अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। उसके पुत्र का नाम गोरव विष्टा व जन्म तिथि 21-8-1999 गांव कलारा, परगना चम्दलोग, उप-तहसील नेरवा में हुआ है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में किसी को कोई उजर न/एतराज हो तो वह अपना उजर भिति 32-12-2001 सुबह 10.00 बजे अदालत के कार्यालय में उपस्थित होकर कर सकते हैं।

आज दिनांक 22-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

किरपा राम शर्मा,
नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरवा, जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत राजेश शर्मा उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (प्र. मी. ज). शिमला जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

श्रीम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 बाबल नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री मोहिन्द कुमार ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि उसके बेटे दीक्षित वर्मा का नाम व जन्म तिथि 20-1-2000 उनकी ग्राम पंचायत जलेल के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक के बेटे का नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत जलेल के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्ति नामा दिनांक 25-12-2001 तक या इससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सम्बन्धित सचिव ग्राम पंचायत को नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 21-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ है।

मोहर।

राजेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
शिमला (प्र०)।

ब अदालत डा० एम० पी० सूद, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती सूरतो देवी पुत्री श्री ग्यारू राम, निवासी ग्राम रंगूवा, तहसील पांवटा, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

श्रीम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर द्वारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती सूरतो देवी पुत्री श्री ग्यारू राम, निवासी रंगूवा, तहसील पांवटा ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका स्वयं का जन्म दिनांक 1-3-1975 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह अपनी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत जामना के रिकार्ड में 1971 दर्ज है, जो गलत है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के माफ़त सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 19-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हुआ स्थित पांवटा में अदालत या वकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमती सूरतो देवी पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 20-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

एम० पी० सूद,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत डा० एम० पी० सूद, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री बलबीर सिंह पुत्र श्री खजाना सिंह, निवासी काण्डी, तहसील पांवटा, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

श्रीम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री बलबीर सिंह पुत्र श्री खजाना सिंह, निवासी काण्डी, तहसील पांवटा ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी लड़की रीता का जन्म दिनांक 10-9-1997 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानता वश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत सरवोली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है। अतः अब दर्ज किया जाय।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के माफ़त सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 18-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हज़ा स्थित पांवटा साहिब में असालतन या वकालतन हाज़िर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रायना-पत्र श्री बलबीर सिंह पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 19-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

एम० पी० सूद,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब,
जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा हर खास व आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त नाम की दफ़्ती वारे यदि किसी को भी कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह अपना पक्ष अदालत हज़ा में दिनांक 21-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे उपस्थित होकर असालतन या वकालतन प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा एक तरफ़ा कार्यवाही असल में लाते हुए नाम की दफ़्ती वारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 13-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

बी० बी० कर्पनिश,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
रेणुका जी, स्थित संगड़ाह, (हि० प्र०)।

In the court of Shri Yashwant Singh, Sub Judge, Rajgarh,
District Sirmour (H. P.)

Civil Suit No. 49/1 of 2001

Gayatri Devi

Versus

Sant Ram & Others

Versus :

10-Smt. Chainika Bali w/o Shri Manoj Kumar Bali,
r/o Block 22, Sector, Parwanoo, District Solan
(H.P.) .. Defendant No. 10.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the service of the defendant Sl. No. 10 Smt. Chainika Bali w/o Shri Manoj Kumar Bali, r/o Block 22, Parwanoo, District Solan, (H.P.) cannot be affected in the ordinary course of service.

Hence, this proclamation is hereby issued against the defendant No. 10 Smt. Chainika Bali that she should attend this court on or before 17-12-2001 at 10.00 A.M. personally or through pleader or any authorised agent to defend the case failing which the ex-parte proceedings will be initiated against her.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court this 12th day of November, 2001.

Seal

YASHWANT SINGH,
Sub-Judge, Rajgarh,
District Sirmour (H.P.).

व अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, रेणुका जी स्थित संगड़ाह,
जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

तारीख पेशी : 21-12-2001

श्रीमती चम्पा देवी पुत्री शोडी पत्नी स्वर्गीय श्री उमादत्त,
निवासी बडौन (धारदारन), तहसील रेणुका जी, जिला सिरमौर,
(हि० प्र०)।

बनाम

अम जनता

दरखवास्त सेहत नाम श्रीमती चम्पा देवी पुत्री शोडी पत्नी उमादत्त,
निवासी बडौन (धारदारन), तहसील रेणुका जी, जिला सिरमौर
(हि० प्र०)।

श्रीमती चम्पा देवी ने इस अदालत में दरखवास्त दी है कि उसका असल नाम चम्पा देवी है जोकि ग्राम पंचायत जामूकोटी के रिकार्ड में दर्ज है परन्तु राजस्व रिकार्ड पटवार वृत्त खालाक्यार में उसका नाम कान्ता देवी दर्ज है जो कि गलत है तथा जिसकी दफ़्ती बरवाना चाहती है।

व अदालत कलेक्टर, सब-डिविजन, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं० 4/10

तारीख दायरा 16-2-98.

उनवान मुकद्दमा

: मुन्दर सिंह

बनाम

बलबीर सिंह आदि।

किस्म मुकद्दमा : दावा अपील (तकसीम)।

नोटिस बनाम :

1. श्री बलबीर सिंह पुत्र श्री नेतर सिंह, गांव घेली धावोडी, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०), 2. देवेन्द्र पुत्र श्रीमती करमती पत्नी श्री शेर जंग, निवासी घेली धावोडी, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०), 3. श्री जमवल पुत्र श्रीमती करमती पत्नी श्री शेर जंग, निवासी घेली धावोडी, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०), 4. श्रीमती कृन्ता देवी, कौशल्य, तारा देवी, गीता देवी पुत्रियां शेर जंग, निवासी घेली धावोडी, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०), 5. नीरज, 6. सरीता, 7. कमलेश, 8. रीता, सभी नावालिग पुत्र व पुत्रियां 220 श्री मान सिंह द्वारा नैचुअल गारडियन माना श्रीमती तुला विधवा श्री मान सिंह, निवासी पुडली, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०), 9. श्रीमती तुला विधवा श्री मान सिंह, निवासी पुडली, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हिमाचल प्रदेश)।

उपरोक्त उनवान मुकद्दमा में प्रतिवादीगण को बजरिया समन कई बार तब्व किया गया। परन्तु उक्त प्रतिवादीगण की सही तरीके से तामील नहीं हो पा रही है। इसलिए इस अदालत को पूर्ण यकीन हो गया है कि उक्त प्रतिवादीगण की साधारण तौर पर तामील नहीं हो सकती।

अतः उन्हें इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 24-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाज़िर अदालत होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें। अन्यथा हम जाला कार्यवाही असल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 22-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
कलेक्टर, सब-डिविजन, पांवटा साहिब,
जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री के० एस० चौधरी, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी
दण्डाधिकारी बगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)

केहर सिंह पुत्र भूरी सिंह जात राजपूत, गांव हरवाना, तहसील
बगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) प्राथी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

राजपत्र अभिलेख में नाम दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री केहर सिंह पुत्र भूरी सिंह, जान राजपूत, गांव हटवाना ने इस घदालत में प्रायना-पत्र गुजार रखा है कि राजस्व अभिलेख में उसका नाम भाग सिंह दर्ज है जबकि शिवा प्रमाण-पत्र में उसका नाम केहर सिंह दर्ज है इसलिये राजस्व अभिलेख में उसका नाम केहर सिंह उनाम भाग सिंह दख्त दर्ज किया जाये।

धन: इस इशतहार द्वारा हर खास व आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को प्राची का नाम केहर सिंह उपनाम भाग सिंह दर्ज राजस्व अभिलेख करने में कोई उजर या एतगज हो तो वह असातलन या वकालतन दिनांक 22-12-2001 (चार अक्टूबर दो हजार एक) को प्रातः 10 बजे अदालत हजा में वेश करे अन्यथा कागजात मान में नाम को दफ्ती के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

प्रातः दिनांक 16-10-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जागे हुया।

मोहर : के० एस० चौधरी,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी इण्डाधिकारी
बंगाणा, जिला ऊना, (हि० प्र०)।

न्यायालय श्री के० एस० चौधरी, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता
प्रथम वर्ग, बंगाणा, जिला ऊना

मुकदमा नं० नसीकम भूमि तिथि पेशी : 22-12-2001

श्री लाल चन्द पुत्र निध, शकुन्तला देवी पत्नी श्री लाल चन्द,
हरि चन्द पुत्र श्री श्याम लाल, गांव राजनी उपरली, तहसील बंगाणा,
जिला ऊना। प्राथी

बनाम

1. श्री अनन्त राम पुत्र तुलसी राम, 2. रोशन लाल पुत्र तुलसी, 3. परस राम, 4. कर्प चन्द, 5. हम राज, 6. जगत राम पुत्रान मन्त राम, 7. देव राज पुत्र बमन्ता उर्फ सन्त राम, 8. विमला देवी पत्नी संसार चन्द, 9. किशन चन्द, 10. बृज लाल पुत्र जाना, 11. जानी पुत्र दोल, 12. तारा देवी पुत्री रूनिया, 13. राकेश कुमार, 14. राजेश कुमार पुत्रान जाना, 15. सुदेश कुमार, दिनेश कुमार, विजय कुमार पुत्रान परत चन्द, 16. रूप चन्द पुत्र प्रभू 17. बाबू राम, 18. देव राज पुत्र खजाना, 19. प्रभा पुत्र निध, 20. संगत राम, 21. संसार चन्द पुत्रान निध राम, 22. विशनी, 23. जसवन्त, 24. जगीर सिंह, 25. गरदेव, गांव राजनी उपरली, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना।

मुकदमा तत्समीप भूमि तादादी 2-40-79 हेक्टेयर, खेवट नं० 36, खतोनी नं० 45 से 100, खसरा नं० 99, किता 99 गांव राजनी उपरली, जमाबन्दी 1994-95।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में प्रतिवादी नं० 1 से 25 तक उपरोक्त को इस न्यायालय द्वारा कई बार समन जारी किये गये परन्तु तामील न हो सकी। अतः इस न्यायालय को अब पूर्ण सन्तुष्टी है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को तामील साधारण तरीका से नहीं हो सकती है इसलिए इस राजपत्र इशतहार मुनादी द्वारा प्रतिवादीगण उपरोक्त 1 से 25 तक वर्णित को सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 22-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे इस मुकदमा को पैरवी हेतु व्यक्तिगत रूप से या किसी अधिवक्ता के माध्यम से इस न्यायालय में उपस्थित आयें अन्यथा अनुपस्थिति की अवस्था में एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही प्रसत में लाई जायेगी तथा बाद में कोई आपर्ति मान्य नहीं होगी।

प्रातः दिनांक 6-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर तथा न्यायालय की मुद्रिका सहित जारी हुया।

माहर : के० एस० चौधरी,
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग,
बंगाणा, जिला ऊना, (हि० प्र०)।

न्यायालय श्री के० एस० चौधरी, तहसीलदार एवं लैण्ड रिकार्ड अधिकारी बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)

मुकदमा नं० : 2/BT/LR/2001 तिथि पेशी : 22/12/2001

मेजर हरनाम सिंह पुत्र भोन् राम, गांव नाहरी देवी सिंह,
मोजा थरलू, तहसील बंगाणा प्राथी।

बनाम

1. श्री मोजी राम, 2. बस्ता राम पुत्रान भगवान सिंह, 3. अनन्त राम पुत्र निक्का, 4. केसरी चन्द, 5. जमोत सिंह पुत्रान लछमन, 6. संसार चन्द 7. किशोरी लाल पुत्र घनी राम, 8. माया देवी, 9. सत्या देवी पुत्रीया घनी राम, 10. रतन चन्द पुत्र सन्त, 11. रणिया, प्रेम चन्द, 12. बीर सिंह पुत्रान नत्थू, 13. अरकू देवी पत्नी नत्थू, 14. प्रधाना पुत्रभुंगर, गांव नाहरी देवी सिंह, तप्पा अरलू, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) प्रतिवादीगण।

मुकदमा Resumption of Land भूमि तादादी 0-06-37 हेक्टेयर, खसरा नं० 416, 417, 474, 336, 339, 15, 13, 16, 331, 349, 351, 350, गांव नाहरी देवी सिंह, जमाबन्दी।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में प्रतिवादी नं० 1 से 14 उपरोक्त को इस न्यायालय द्वारा कई बार समन जारी किया गया परन्तु तामील न हो सकी। अतः इस न्यायालय को अब पूर्ण सन्तुष्टी है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण की तामील साधारण तरीका से नहीं हो सकती है इसलिए इस राजपत्र इशतहार मुनादी द्वारा प्रतिवादीगण उपरोक्त 1 से 14 तक को सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 22-12-2001 को प्रातः 10 बजे इस मुकदमा को पैरवी हेतु व्यक्तिगत रूप से या किसी अधिवक्ता के माध्यम से इस न्यायालय में उपस्थित आयें अन्यथा अनुपस्थिति की अवस्था में एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही प्रसत में लाई जायेगी तथा बाद में कोई आपर्ति मान्य नहीं होगी।

प्रातः दिनांक 11-11-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर तथा मोहर न्यायालय की मुद्रिका सहित जारी हुया

मोहर : के० एस० चौधरी,
तहसीलदार एवं लैण्ड रिकार्ड अधिकारी,
बंगाणा, जिला ऊना, (हि० प्र०)।

In the Court of R. L. Raghu. District Judge, Una, Himachal Pradesh

Succession Petition No. : 2/2001

Date of Hearing : 15-12-2001

Sudesh Rani Vs. General Public

Sudesh Rani wd/o Milkhi Ram Sharma, r/o Village Jhamber, Tehsil and District Una (H. P.)

Appellant.

Versus

General Public Respondent.

Whereas the petitioner has filed an application/petition in this court for Grant of succession certificate in respect of Milkhi Ram s/o Rikhi Ram, died on 2-1-1998, for the purpose of drawing the pension and others emoluments lying in the office of Parsar Bharti, All India Radio Akashwani, New Delhi.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the respondent General Public and Kith and Kins of

the deceased Milkhi Ram s/o Rikhi Ram, r/o Village Jhamber, Tehsil and District Una, (H. P.), for filing objection, if any, before this court on 15-12-2001 at 10 A. M. personally or through an advocate or authorised agent to defend the case, failing which the petition will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court this the 22nd day of November, 2001.

Seal.

R. L. RAGHU,
District Judge, Una.

ब अदालत नरेन्द्र शर्मा, शादी पंजीकरण अधिकारी, अम्ब, जिला अना (हि० प्र०)

विषय.—शादी पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र प्रदान करने बारे ।

हरनाम सिंह

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री हरनाम सिंह पुत्र श्री छत्रज राम, वासी ग्राम पथल, डाक-खाना पोलिया, तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा ने एक दरखास्त प्रस्तुत की है जिसमें उसने लिखा है कि उसकी शादी मधु पुत्री श्री करतार चन्द, गांव व डाकखाना चलेट, तहसील अम्ब, जिला अना, हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ दिनांक 17-10-2001 को हुई है का पंजीकरण किया जा कर उसे शादी पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र दिया जावे ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता व सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को शादी पंजीकरण बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जाकर प्रार्थी का शादी प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जायेगा ।

आज दिनांक 30-10-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,
शादी पंजीकरण अधिकारी,
अम्ब, जिला अना, (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत श्री नरेन्द्र शर्मा, शादी पंजीकरण अधिकारी, अम्ब, जिला अना (हि० प्र०)

विषय.—शादी पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र प्रदान करने बारे ।

राम प्रशाद

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री राम प्रशाद पुत्र श्री बसंत राम, वासी ग्राम मवा-कहोला, तहसील अम्ब, जिला अना ने एक दरखास्त प्रस्तुत की है जिसमें उसने लिखा है कि उसकी शादी नीलम रानी उर्फ सुनीता पुत्री श्री बेनी राम, गांव व डाकखाना स्तोथर, तहसील अम्ब, जिला अना, हि० प्र० के साथ दिनांक 10-7-2001 को हुई है, का पंजीकरण किया जाकर उसे शादी पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र दिया जावे ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता ग्राम व सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को शादी पंजीकरण बारे एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जाकर प्रार्थी को शादी

पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जाएगा तथा बाद में कोई उजर काबले समाप्त न होगा ।

मोहर ।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,
शादी पंजीकरण अधिकारी,
अम्ब, जिला अना, (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, अना, तहसील व जिला अना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण पत्र ।

वकील अहमद

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

वकील अहमद पुत्र सुखन, निवासी गांव जनकौर, तहसील व जिला अना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र मुशतकीम का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाये । इसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 15-3-1995 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव जनकौर है ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई उजर/प्राप्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जायेगा ।

आज दिनांक 24-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
अना, तहसील व जिला अना, (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, अना, तहसील व जिला अना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र ।

ज्ञान चन्द

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

श्री ज्ञान चन्द पुत्र श्री नुहबत, निवासी गांव अना, मुहल्ला गल्ला, त० व जिला अना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसके पुत्र जगदीश कुमार का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज किया जावे । उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 11-10-1996 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव अना है ।

नतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वाले कोई उजर/आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा अधालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 22-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना,
तहसील व जिला ऊना

मुकद्दमा : मृत्यु निधि प्रमाण पत्र।

कमल किशोर

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री कमल किशोर पुत्र बसन्ता मल, निवासी गांव ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में एक दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पत्नी भगवती देवी की मृत्यु किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत मृत्यु रजिस्टर में दर्ज न करवाई जा सकी है जो कि अब करवाई जावे। श्राधी ने मृतक की मृत्यु तिथि 8-12-1977 बताई है तथा मृत्यु स्थान ऊना बताया है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता ग्राम को तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उक्त मृतक की मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करवाने वाले कोई आपत्ति एवं उजर हो तो वह दिनांक 28-12-2001 को प्रातः दस बजे अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर श्राधी द्वारा बताई गई मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने

के निर्देश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे तथा बाद में कोई भी उजर काबल समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 13-11-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना,
तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

वकील ग्रहमद

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

वकील ग्रहमद पुत्र श्री सुखन, निवासी गांव जनकौर, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र मूर्जीसम का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जावे। उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 7-5-1996 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म स्थान गांव जनकौर है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने में कोई उजर आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 31-12-2001 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा अधालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 24-11-2001 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन

अन्य-

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की संघानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

अन्य-

अनुपूरक

अन्य-